

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 18, 1987

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Give us, we pray, O God, the honesty to admit our faults. For being selfish, we confess; for not taking the time to hear the truth, we beg Your mercy; from hasty words or unkind thoughts, deliver us. Guide us, gracious God, that our words, our thoughts, our acts may respect Your good world and the people of Your creation and through our confession we may be forgiven to lead lives worthy of the calling You have given. In Your name, we pray, Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to designate March 21, 1987, as Afghanistan Day.

## WELCOME 1987 MAID OF COTTON TO WASHINGTON, DC

(Mr. COLEMAN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I take this opportunity to congratulate and welcome to Washington a native El Pasoan, Amy Gough, who has been selected as the 1987 Maid of Cotton.

Amy is a sophomore at the University of Texas. As part of her official duties, she will travel extensively throughout the United States and the world to focus attention on the importance of cotton for employment, world trade, and productivity.

The 16th Congressional District of Texas produces the Extra-Long Pima cotton, desired the world over for its high quality. I am especially proud that we have also produced the national symbol of this most important industry, and I urge my colleagues to join me in welcoming Amy here to Washington today.

## LET THE STATES DETERMINE SPEED LIMITS

(Mr. FIELDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, like the vast majority of my constituents, I favor giving the States the option of raising the speed limit on rural interstate highways within their boundaries from 55 to 65 miles per hour without risking the loss of much-needed highway funds.

Most drivers simply do not drive 55 miles an hour. In my State of Texas, the great distances between major population centers virtually requires a higher speed limit. But that would be a decision for the men and women in Austin to make. If State legislators in Boston or Albany or Trenton didn't want to raise the speed limit on their interstates, they wouldn't have to.

Many will say that this is a safety issue. It is not. Driving speed and safety have no correlation whatsoever. That fact has been proven in study after study after study—many of which will be cited in the upcoming debate.

Rural interstate highways were designed and built to accommodate traffic traveling at up to 70 miles per hour. And by far, those rural interstates are our safest roads. They account for 25 percent of all the miles driven each year—but only 4 percent of the traffic deaths recorded each year. By contrast, rural roads with posted speed limits of 30 miles per hour have fatality rates four times higher than roads posted at 55 miles per hour.

Mr. Speaker, let's get Congress out of the business of setting speed limits on our Nation's rural highways. Let's allow the State legislatures to decide for themselves what the speed limit should be on rural interstates located within their States.

## A PLEA FOR KEVIN REID'S LIFE

(Mr. NELSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just signed on as an original cosponsor of legislation to proclaim April 26 through May 2, 1987, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week." The timing of this legislation for myself, in particular, cannot go unnoticed.

Kevin Reid, a 2-year-old boy, weighing just 28 pounds, from my district in Brevard County, is suffering from a rare liver disease. Kevin is a patient at the Children's Hospital in Pittsburgh where, just yesterday, he underwent surgery to stop the bleeding in his small intestines. Kevin needs a new liver in order to survive and is currently on a donor waiting list. The emotional strain on Kevin and his family conveys the importance of this issue and the need for an awareness of organ donation.

I along with my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, the Honorable MIKE ESPY who is a close personal friend of the Reid family, invite all of you to join in this effort to educate our constituents on the need for organ donation. I am here today to make a plea for Kevin's life in hopes that a donor organ becomes available. In the meantime, we can all contribute to this important effort by voluntarily signing donor cards so someday we can all give someone else the "gift of life."

## THE BUDGET

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as long as budget negotiations are sliding into the gutter, with accusations from House Democrats that the President is telling "little white lies" let me remind our majority of the old line about people who live in glass houses.

The House Democrats have been naughty little budgeteers themselves.

You House Democrats haven't been updating your economic assumptions regularly like your Senate majority counterparts, so I suspect you can bring up large supplementals in the House and argue wrongfully that they don't add to the deficit.

We know these supplementals will add to the deficit.

The Senate has updated their score-keeping—why aren't we? Why are we operating under all of these little white lies?

The fact is that this whole budget process in the House is a lie, and not a white lie. It is a deliberate deception. A big lie.

If the President's budget is a white lie, what do we call the Democrats' refusal to write one at all?

I've had it with this sophomoric rhetoric. Let's get down to business.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

□ 1410

# SUPPORT THE NATIONAL TISSUE AND ORGAN DONOR PROGRAM

(Mr. ESPY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, Kevin Lorenzo Reid is the 2-year-old son of a personal friend. Kevin suffers from biliary atresia, a disease of unknown causes that produces inflammation and obstruction of bile ducts. This condition causes liver disease, jaundice and cirrhosis in children. This is often a fatal disease.

Kevin's life, and the lives of his family have been grossly impaired due to the emotional and physical strain. Astronomical costs are incurred for additional living expenses while Kevin is in the hospital in Pittsburgh and travel cost associated with his hospital stay.

Mr. Speaker, Kevin needs a liver in order to survive and I am asking the American people to become concerned.

I along with my distinguished colleague, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Kevin's home State, urge you to support the National Tissue and Organ Donor Program of which I am proud to become a cosponsor. Kevin and others like him, will benefit greatly from our combined effort.

## INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ALLOW CHAMPUS TO REIMBURSE CERTAIN PHILANTHROPIC HEALTH CARE INSTITUTIONS FOR SERVICES RENDERED TO CHAMPUS-ELIGIBLE PATIENTS

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which will reform CHAMPUS regulations to provide payment to certain philanthropic hospitals which do not charge their patients or impose a legal obligation to pay for services rendered.

Under current regs, Mr. Speaker, such a hospital is denied reimbursement unless the patient is billed and required to share some of the cost.

While we were successful last year in effecting a stay in the enforcement of those regulations for 1 year, previous administration of the CHAMPUS Program has proved especially detrimental to one of the finest hospitals in the world, Deborah Heart and Lung Center of Browns Mills, NJ.

Absent a permanent change in law, Mr. Speaker, Deborah will soon be forced to pick up the tab once again for CHAMPUS patients or, in the final analysis, may have to refuse treatment

of CHAMPUS-eligible individuals because CHAMPUS is unwilling to reimburse while other Government-sponsored health plans continue to pay for services rendered at the center.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that the Deborah Heart and Lung Center is located adjacent or in close proximity to three military installations—Maguire AFB, Fort Dix, and Lakehurst Naval Air Engineering Center. So it shouldn't come as any surprise that over the years, thousands of military dependents and retirees have been treated at Deborah on an inpatient and outpatient basis.

Let us not further penalize both the hospital and CHAMPUS recipients. Let me note here, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is cosponsored by my good friend, Mr. SAXTON, who has worked hard to restore this avenue of reimbursement for Deborah. I thank him for his support.

I urge my colleagues to back this bill, and I look forward to providing a permanent solution to this problem.

## THE LONG-OVERDUE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. CHAPMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider a long-overdue highway bill. The pending projects in my State of Texas affect some 600 million dollars' worth of contracts in the next 4 months and more than 18,000 highway jobs.

One of the provisions in this bill will direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a feasibility study of the proposed Interstate 49. I-49 is a vision that would link Shreveport through New Orleans to Texarkana to Minneapolis, MN, and today we can move this project closer to becoming a reality.

Also in the bill is a provision that would authorize improvements to an existing east Texas highway—U.S. 59.

Approximately 115 miles of U.S. 59 runs through my district in east Texas and provides the only major north-south link from Houston to Texarkana. A great deal of this highway is two lane, and is in poor condition.

Widening U.S. 59 and the future completion of Interstate 49 would place our area in the center of the south and southwest of our Nation's highway system, providing an efficient transportation network, jobs, safety, and new business development. Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of Members for this bill.

## RESTORING THE STATES RIGHTS TO RAISE THE SPEED LIMIT

(Mr. GREGG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of States rights, specifically the right of States to raise the speed limit on the rural interstates to 65 miles an hour.

The majority of Americans have already voted on this issue; they voted with their gas pedals. In New Hampshire, for example, a number of Federal studies have shown that the vast majority of New Hampshire citizens or people driving on New Hampshire interstates do not abide by the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit; and there is a good reason for that.

People driving from Coos County down into the southern part of the State or driving north recognize in traveling over these vast expanses of rural highway the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit makes little sense.

This was a well-intentioned effort when it was originally thought of, but it has not worked. We should acknowledge that failure and we should correct it today by passing onto the States the ability to raise their speed limits to 65 miles an hour.

## HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE VOTES CREDIT CARD INTEREST RATE CEILING

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, reported important consumer legislation. The legislation, which outlines broad disclosures which credit card companies must make when soliciting credit card customers, also contains a ceiling, the maximum amount of interest that can be charged on credit cards.

The subcommittee on a vote of 5 to 3, adopted my amendment which establishes the ceiling at 8 percentage points above the yield on 1-year Treasury securities. At today's rates, the ceiling would be 13.8 percent.

This amendment is both fair to consumers and credit card customers as the rate can go both up and down as the economy changes.

Yesterday was St. Patrick's Day, a great day for the Irish. Today is Credit Card Interest Rate Cap Day, a great day for the consumer. I hope that consumers will continue to have many great days.



### WE CANNOT AFFORD TO FORGET AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, we usually equate anniversaries with happiness, frivolity, and good times; not the case with Terry Anderson, who this week celebrated his second anniversary as a hostage.

This anniversary involves no good times, no happiness, no frivolity. It rather represents shame, suffering, pain and misery. Six American hostages remain confined against their will in the Middle East, and it is my duty and your duty as Americans not to abandon these hostages.

I do not have the solution to the problem, Mr. Speaker, but I do know if we ignore the problem it will never be resolved; and these hostages likely will never be released. Let us remember these hostages in our prayers, and let us not permit this issue to die on the back burner of the legislative cooker.

### ARE ELECTRIC POWER PURCHASES FROM CANADA REALLY A BARGAIN FOR THE UNITED STATES?

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, while the United States is worrying about its balance of payments, there's an item that someone ought to look at closely. Last year we imported a net of almost \$1.2 billion in electric power from Canada. There are those who think that it's a bargain and that we should be glad to have it. I'm a little suspicious of bargains. I'd like to know whether much of that power couldn't be supplied by U.S. utilities and their suppliers instead of exporting capital and jobs. I'd like to know whether there is a level playing field for trade between United States electric utilities that are owned by private shareholders and the Canadian electrics which are 95 percent owned by the provincial governments and that don't play by commercial rules. I'd like someone to look into unfair subsidies of Canadian power which are taking away jobs in the United States utility and coal industries. And by the way, I think that Secretary of the Interior Donald Hodel is right when he says that shrill Canadian complaints about acid rain and environmental problems ought to be listened to with a lot more skepticism.

### THE SPEED LIMIT VOTE

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, later in the day, this body will consider increasing the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstate highways.

I support this proposal. The American public supports it. And I urge all Members to support it.

Do not let yourselves be intimidated by the voices on the other side of this issue. They would have you believe that increasing the speed limit would result in increased highway fatalities.

In many States west of the Mississippi, our highways are constructed so as to safely tolerate travel at 65. I would like to allow our Governors and local officials some discretion in determining which areas might make use of the amended statute.

Rural States and townships are in the best position to judge the wisdom of permitting an increase. I urge passage of the proposal and ask Members from all parts of the country to support it.

□ 1420

### THE POWER TO SET SPEED LIMITS BELONGS WITH THE STATES

(Mr. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in voting for House Concurrent Resolution 77 later this afternoon. This technical amendment to H.R. 2 will allow States to increase the speed limit to 65 on rural interstate highways.

The power to set speed limits is the right of the State. The current mandatory enforcement of the 55-mile-per-hour limit by the Federal Government is nothing more than coercion, achieved through manipulation of funds. I believe House Concurrent Resolution 77 moves transportation policy in the right direction—toward restoration of State power over traffic control.

The current national speed limit also fails to take into consideration regional differences. Many rural interstate highways in Idaho have relatively light traffic and were constructed to handle speeds exceeding 55 miles per hour. This is the case in other States as well. Traffic volume and road conditions differ from State to State, and State Governments need the freedom and authority to deal with those differences.

I strongly urge you to join me in voting to give States the option to increase rural interstate speed limits to 65 miles per hour.

### LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT INCREASES IN LOCAL TELEPHONE ACCESS CHARGES

(Mr. JONTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, just last Thursday a joint panel of Federal and State regulators recommended that the Federal Communications Commission increase telephone access charges. These access fees are charges local telephone customers pay as part of their monthly phone bill for the connection between their homes or businesses and the telephone network.

The board's recommendation would increase the \$2 monthly access fee which residential users now pay by an additional \$1.50. Businesses with more than one line, which now pay up to \$6 per month, would pay an additional \$3.

The access fees which residential users and businesses now pay are already too much. This latest recommendation only compounds the injustice of these fees, which are an effort by the telephone industry to load costs on captive local telephone customers who have no alternatives.

The proposal to sugarcoat this rate hike by phasing it in with a 60-cent increase in June, to be followed with subsequent increases, doesn't reduce the effect this will ultimately have on consumers; \$3.7 billion in new costs to local consumers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 782, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] to prohibit the FCC from implementing any increase in local telephone access charges.

### TRADE PROTECTION LEGISLATION IS SHORTSIGHTED

(Mr. LIGHTFOOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, this week the House Ways and Means Committee, accompanied by other House committees, will begin marking up an omnibus trade measure for eventual consideration in this body—legislation that closely resembles trade measures debated by Congress in the last session.

While the current version of H.R. 3 is less damaging than H.R. 4800 considered in the last Congress, it's still a bad idea. Protectionist measures are not the answers to our trade deficit. Trade wars do not expand exports.

Of particular concern to me are agricultural exports. In 1985, we sold nearly 37 billion dollars' worth of agricultural products to other countries. We export nearly one-third of all farm commodities grown. We sold 13 billion

dollars' worth of farm products to those countries who are the most likely targets of trade protection legislation.

Cutting imports from these countries only reduces their ability to purchase our products. For that reason, I see trade legislation as shortsighted and plan to oppose H.R. 3 when it comes to us for a vote. I hope my colleagues will do the same.

#### WELFARE REFORM BILL: WORK AND TRAINING IS THE KEY LINKAGE

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the welfare reform bill called the Work Opportunities and Retraining Compact of 1987. Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN will shortly introduce identical legislation in the Senate. There are a number of sponsors on both sides, led on the Republican side by Representative NANCY JOHNSON. There is a growing consensus on the need for welfare reform. The common ground is that work and training must be at the core of any comprehensive welfare reform. For the first time, under this bill States would be required to offer education, training, and employment assistance for those on welfare. In turn, welfare recipients with children above the age of 3 would have to register, be counseled, assessed and referred to an appropriate activity.

Child care, transportation and other necessary support services would have to be provided. No longer will welfare mean just a check. It will also mean a chance. I believe that this effective welfare-work linkage will be the leading edge of still broader welfare initiatives.

#### THE TIME HAS COME FOR WELFARE REFORM

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for welfare reform. The only way out of dependence on a handout is employment, and the only way to insure employment is through the education and development of job skills. Today Representative SANDER LEVIN and I will introduce the work training opportunities compact.

Our program simplifies the administration of existing welfare training programs by consolidating them under the direction of HHS. It strengthens the linkage between these programs of the Job Training Partnership Act and work and training efforts in States. It

promotes early intervention, especially crucial to teen mothers, so that one bad decision does not consign them and their families to hopelessness and poverty. Our program provides those support services without which no welfare reform act can really mean anything in anyone's life. Child care, transportation, health insurance, the expense of any one of these may force even the most determined parent back to dependence on public assistance.

Our greatest natural resource is our people. So let us begin investing in our people for the future of us all. Let us begin with welfare reform by promoting strong people and strong families. Let us stop fostering dependence, discouragement, and generations of poverty.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE WASHBURN UNIVERSITY "ICHABODS"

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and very proud to announce to my colleagues today that the Washburn University Ichabods of Topeka, KS, last night defeated a great West Virginia basketball team, 79 to 77, to win the NIIA national basketball championship in Kansas City.

They had an incredible season, Mr. Speaker, with a record of 35 wins as against 4 losses. They ended their season with 22 straight wins, and all Topekans, Kansans, and Washburn University fans all over America are indeed proud of our great young basketball coach Bob Chipman and his players, Sprew, Meier, Hamilton, Sumler, Reilly, Wilson, Downing, and Davenport. We congratulate you and wish you all the best in the years ahead.

#### WHAT THE DEMOCRATS REALLY DO TO AMERICANS

(Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a major newspaper indicated today the Democrats are trying to talk about a bipartisan budget because they have no answers to the problems themselves. But I would like to stand up for my Democratic colleagues. They have come up with three different answers to achieve a budget resolution.

First, under the leadership of the new Speaker they have proposed more taxes.

Second, they have proposed that we ignore our spending goals.

Third, they propose even more taxes.

Well, Republicans will not place the onerous burden of overspending on

the working men and women of America, nor will Republicans say that bipartisanship is taking from senior citizens their hard-earned money.

That is not what we call bipartisanship. We call that what the Democrats really do to Americans.

□ 1430

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 77

(Mr. GRAY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the author of House Concurrent Resolution 77, which, if adopted this afternoon, would make it permissive, not mandatory, to increase speed limits on rural interstates to 65, I want to announce to my colleagues that the first order of business will be the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act, and then House Concurrent Resolution 77 will come up immediately following adoption of the conference report. This is a good resolution and I hope the Members can be on the floor and support this needed resolution.

#### WHERE IS THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET?

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, when will House Democrats get serious about the budget process? The President sent up his budget early in January on time that met the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets. But for the last 2½ months, the Congress has had a ball kicking around the President's budget, pooch-pooching his suggestions, ignoring and criticizing his scorekeeping and everything about it.

Now it is time for the Democrats to put up. Put your cards on the table. Well, lo and behold, the Democrats are finding it is a pretty tough job to come up with a budget resolution.

So what do they do? First, they say, "Let us forget about the \$108 billion budget target," before they even get serious at all about trying to write a budget.

Second, they apparently begin to raise spending, as they always like to do. Then they say to House Republicans, "Oh, come join us and try to work this thing out," but very quickly withdraw that invitation.

Now with no chairman's mark in hand, they say, "Let us take no risk; let us go forward and see what happens."

What leadership. Put up your budget, Democrats, then let us get serious about a real budget that includes



reconciliation and no extraneous additional spending.

#### END FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN SPEED LIMITS

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, later today, we will vote on whether or not to allow States to raise the maximum speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates.

Allowing States to raise the speed limit is a step in the right direction. But it does not go far enough. We should actually end Federal involvement in speed limits altogether. Setting speed limits is not a Federal responsibility.

The current 55-mile-per-hour law forces States to set and enforce the 55-mile-per-hour limit by threatening a reduction in their highway funding if they do not comply. My own State of Arizona was victimized by this law recently, when about half a million dollars was withheld.

That is not fair to Arizona. It is not fair to make lawbreakers of most Americans, who typically exceed the speed limit. Where highways are designed to accommodate higher speeds safely, the limit ought to be raised. And in any case, it is the responsibility of State officials to determine what the limit ought to be on the roadways within their jurisdictions.

I hope we will recede to the Senate on this matter and allow the limit to be raised.

#### THE SONG OF THE CANDY MAN

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Americans pay dearly for their sweet tooth. Not because they eat too much sugar, but because the U.S. Government supports the small U.S. sugar production industry with guaranteed prices so high that consumers pay three times more for sugar than they should. The sugar subsidy plan guarantees U.S. sugar producers a high margin for sugar they sell at home by jacking up domestic prices while imposing strict sugar import quotas.

U.S. candy manufacturers must buy this subsidized sugar, but foreign candy makers, who purchase market-rate world sugar, sell their candy here at a lower price. This puts the American candy man at an unfair competitive disadvantage.

Now the administration wants to pay sugar producers more than \$1 billion to stop growing sugar beets and cane. These transition payments are really bribes to muffle the complaining while

the support price is lowered. The sugar program, and this new farm welfare proposal, are a microcosm of the absurdities of our agricultural programs.

It's time we stopped this nonsense. No transition payments, no quotas, and no sky-high price floors. Let the U.S. candy man compete in a free market.

#### LET STATES MAKE SPEED LIMIT DETERMINATIONS

(Mr. NIELSON of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], chairman of Public Works and Transportation, on the expeditious manner in which he handled the tough decisions facing the conference committee on the 4R formula and for separating the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit from the rest of the bill in order that we may have a separate vote without delaying the bill and depriving the States of their highway funds.

My congressional district covers 38,000 square miles larger than many of our States. I travel my district by car over parts of rural interstate highways. Drivers, either traveling to destinations in my State or through Utah to other States are not obeying the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and it is not enforceable. Data from the Federal Highway Administration for 1985 substantiates those driver attitudes by disclosing that the 85th percentile speed on rural interstates is now 66.1 miles per hour and the percentage of drivers exceeding 55 miles per hour on rural interstates stands at 75.3 percent nationally. The fatality rate on those highways has decreased from 1.71 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 1980, when highway speeds were lower, to 1.40 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 1985. The driving public perceives the safe speed to be 65 miles per hour and that places their thinking near the 85th percentile. As to enforcement, we could more effectively use those resources in areas where accident and fatality rates are higher. States should have the right to examine the highway statistics on speed limits, safety and enforcement and determine what is best for the driving public in their own States. States should not be mandated by unenforceable regulations where statistically they are able to determine what is in the best interest of the traveling public in their jurisdiction.

The 55 mile-per-hour was prudent and may still be in heavily traveled urban areas, when there were gasoline shortages and we are striving to economize. We perceived that slower miles per hour would save lives. Those statistics were based on early projections

but lane miles traveled was not a consideration. Based on the actual percentages made available to us today by the FHWA, 65 miles per hour is right and prudent for rural interstates. I urge your vote in favor of giving States the right to make that determination.

#### LET US BRING FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY BACK TO CONGRESS

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing a legislative package that is aimed at making Congress more accountable for its spending decisions. This is especially important in light of the legislative shenanigans employed by Congress to push through the recent pay raise, a raise Congress neither deserved nor earned.

The package will have three parts. Part 1, will repeal House rule 49 which mandates that the House will not have a recorded vote on the debt ceiling. This is a blatant evasion of responsibility by the Congress.

Part 2 will revise the rescission process by requiring Congress to specifically disapprove any Presidential rescission of budget authority. Under current law, money the President wants rescinded, or permanently canceled, must be spent unless the Congress specifically approves the rescission. In other words, if the Congress does nothing the money is spent. Again, an evasion of responsibility.

As with the rescission bill, part 3 will require Congress to specifically disapprove any deferral proposed by the President. This is especially important in light of the Supreme Court's Chadha decision which drastically changed the workings of the deferral process. My bill would correct that process while maintaining the original intent and spirit of the Impoundment and Control Act of 1973.

The American people have a right to know their representatives stand on important spending issues. Under current law, Congress can cover its tracks and hide behind procedures that allow Congress to spend money without even voting. It is hardly asking a lot of Congress to justify specific expenditures, especially when we pass catch-all appropriations bills or continuing resolutions loaded with pork barrel spending. If Congress cannot justify these expenditures or debt ceiling increases by voting on them, then it is obvious there are serious questions as to whether they are in the national interest.

I urge my colleagues to join in my effort to bring accountability back to Congress.

#### TAX ON IMPORTED OIL IS SHORTSIGHTED, SIMPLISTIC, AND UNFAIR

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, shiver me timbers. You can imagine how much I'm shivering with all the talk around here about imposing an oil import tax.

And you can imagine if one is enacted how my constituents will be shivering in the cold with their heating bills going through the roof.

Meanwhile, back in the Southwest, all those fat cat oil barons will be basking in the Sun beating a path down to their local banks trying to buy back all those repossessed Rolls Royces and Mercedes.

Like a persistent weed, oil import taxes rise every spring as a means of reducing the deficit and meeting the Gramm-Rudman target.

It looks like we're going to have trouble meeting the Gramm-Rudman target again this year. What a surprise. I guess we used up our supply of smoke and mirrors last year and now are looking for the quick fix solution.

A tax on imported crude oil and products has got to be the most regressive, ill-conceived, penny-wise, pound-foolish quick fix imaginable.

A \$5 per barrel tax would raise inflation, increase unemployment, and hurt energy intensive U.S. industries trading abroad.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase H.L. Mencken, for every complex problem, there is an easy solution \* \* \* and its usually wrong. A tax on imported oil is short sighted, simplistic, and unfair.

So shiver ye timbers, cause you ain't heard the last from SILVIO O. CONTE on an oil import tax.

□ 1440

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION RELATIVE TO VOTE ON THE MONTGOMERY GI BILL ACT

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, official business prevented me from being here to cast my vote in favor of H.R. 1085, the Montgomery GI Bill Act.

I strongly supported this extension of the new GI bill test program when this measure came before our Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I certainly would have done so again yesterday.

The evidence clearly shows that this program has had a tremendous, positive impact on the quality of new re-

cruits and their retention. I might add that unlike other Federal education programs, these young men and women must pay for their benefits through military service before they can use them, not after.

Not only is it good for the quality of our Armed Forces, it is good for the Nation as a whole. The GI bill is an investment in the education of our young people, an investment in America's future leaders.

And I can think of no better return on an investment than a wiser, brighter and more peaceful future for our children and our country.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be on hand yesterday for the rollcall vote on making the new GI bill permanent legislation. I was an original cosponsor of this bill when it was introduced at the beginning of this session. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 31 in favor of H.R. 1085.

#### PORK BARREL PROJECTS ROB STATES OF ALLOCATED MONEYS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, under the highway legislation that we will consider here in a few moments, 47 of 50 States will lose money under the formula of allocation. That is 47 of 50 States. And why? Because we decided to have a bunch of pork barrel projects put in the bill that rob these States of their money. My own State of Pennsylvania is robbed of \$58 million.

What would happen if we would take out just one of those demonstration projects—just one, the biggest one? Four more States would get money and would be made whole again. Then it would be 43 of 50 States that would get enough money to make them whole again next year. If you take out one pork barrel project, 43 of 50 States could be made whole, based upon their allocation of last year.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if there was such a case to be made against pork, it is the fact that it robs people of the money they deserve and the allocation they have paid for.

#### INACCURATE FHWA INFORMATION LEADS TO CONFUSION ON HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that I certainly do not blame him for having inaccurate

information, but I say that it is inaccurate information because it is stuff that has been put out by the Federal Highway Administration.

The fact is that the reason why 47 of 50 States lose funds in this bill is because we are complying with the budget resolution. Surprise, surprise. There is a budget resolution which says that we must cut the obligational ceiling, and we are doing that, which means we are taking \$1 billion out of the ceiling which otherwise was there.

So this very misleading document, this scurrilous document which has been circulated by the Federal Highway Administration, simply misleads our colleagues.

I would further say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that all of the demonstration projects in this entire bill add up to only 1.3 percent of the bill. But there is another surprise. Do you know that the discretionary dollars, the slush fund that the Secretary of Transportation has, adds up to 6.7 percent of the dollars in the bill?

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that we should not be misled by this information, and I further say that I do not blame my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for standing up here and in good faith quoting this document. He quite accurately tells us what the document says. The problem is that the document itself is fundamentally flawed and is inaccurate.

#### PENNSYLVANIA GIVES SUPPORT TO THE HIGHWAY BILL

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], for his statement and ask him if he does agree that it does seem strange that the people who are most demanding that we stay within the budget limits are the ones who complain about the fact there is not as much money as they would like because we stay within those limits.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I certainly agree with my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, and I further say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, referring again to Pennsylvania, that I can tell him that our Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, Governor Casey, has talking with me personally on this issue, and he vigorously supports this legislation; he vigorously supports this bill. We have strong bipartisan support in Pennsylvania for this bill.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I yield back the balance of my time.



CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2,  
SURFACE TRANSPORTATION  
AND UNIFORM RELOCATION  
ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1987

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 124 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 124

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes, all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived, and the conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration. Following adoption of the conference report it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) to make a correction, relating to the maximum speed limit, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2, debate on the concurrent resolution shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the resolution and a Member opposed thereto, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. KILDEE). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 124 is the rule providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, conference reports are privileged and are considered in the House under the 1 hour rule with no amendments in order. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule further provides that the conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration.

Following the adoption of the conference report, the rule provides for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 77, which would allow States to increase the speed limit from 55 to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the concurrent resolution to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed to the concurrent resolution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the previous question is considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H.R. 2 approves a 5-year authorization of over \$86 billion for highways and mass transit programs in fiscal years 1987 through 1992. The measure would allow for the funding of major highway programs such as the interstate 4R program which is the resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of the interstate system. Also the conference report allows for the funding for rehabilitation and replacement of unsafe bridges throughout the Nation. In addition, Mr. Speaker, there is funding for the primary and secondary highways systems in the country.

Mr. Speaker, with the highway construction season almost here, many States are running out of Federal highway funds and are delaying or cancelling safety and construction improvement projects. If we delay any further, thousands of jobs are in jeopardy. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] for their relentless effort in bringing this fair and bipartisan measure to the House.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on this rule. The bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation requested this rule and it was approved by the Rules Committee on a unanimous voice vote.

The rule permits consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2 and following its adoption, provides for 1 hour's debate and a vote on whether or not to allow the States to raise the speed limit on most of the Interstate Highway System.

I would like to express at this time my admiration for and congratulations to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER]. Under their leadership and through their work over several years, an outstanding highway and mass transit bill has reached the House floor for final approval. They have hammered out a fine bill we can be proud of and they deserve our support.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for 1 hour's debate followed by a straight "yes" or "no" vote on the speed limit issue. Nothing could be more fair to the Members. I urge adoption of the rule.

□ 1450

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Resolution 124 because it brings us to the end of what has been a very long and difficult process, passage of a 5-year authorization for Federal-aid highway construction.

The conference report on H.R. 2, which is made in order by this rule, is a 5-year authorization of \$68.5 billion for the Nation's Federal-Aid Highway Program and \$17.8 billion for mass transit assistance.

Under this rule, the conference report will be considered on its own merits, and I believe the report deserves the overwhelming approval of the body.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report represents the action necessary for this Congress to keep a commitment we made to the American people in 1982, when we increased the Federal gasoline tax for the first time since 1959.

During the lame-duck session of the 97th Congress, after months and months of opposition to a tax increase, the administration finally proposed a gasoline tax increase because the funds were so desperately needed to repair our Nation's highways and to complete the Interstate Highway System.

At the request of this administration, the Congress increased the 4-cent-per-gallon Federal fuel tax to 9 cents per gallon. In my judgment, the Congress and the administration made a commitment, a pledge if you will, to use the \$5.5 billion in annual highway trust fund revenues to build highways.

Mr. Speaker, we all know what has happened to that commitment since the tax increase took effect. We have not had a chance to live up to our word, until now.

For the past 4 years, going back to 1983, the Congress has been unable to pass a 5-year authorization bill. Nearly all of the major highway programs financed by gasoline tax revenues expired last fall. Gasoline tax revenues have been pouring into the highway trust fund, only to remain there unused and unspent.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago the joint leadership of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation asked this House to give it a chance to work out an agreement with the Senate by taking essentially the same bill the House passed last year to an early conference.

The House gave them that chance. And out faith in the joint leadership of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation has been affirmed, and they are ready to present their report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule, so we may consider the conference report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it was said here a few minutes ago that the process set up by this rule is something which could not be more fair to the Members of this House. Well, I have some reason to question what we are doing here and I hope that at least somebody here on the floor can answer the questions.

First of all, let me ask: Under the procedure in this bill, are we considering the issue with regard to the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit as a separate issue?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct; House Concurrent Resolution 77 will determine the speed limit.

Mr. WALKER. So, in adopting this rule what we are doing is we are saying that we are going to have two votes. One on the highway bill itself, and one on the speed limit?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Now, once we have done that, under the process, are we going to send—let us say we would adopt the separate resolution on the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit—will that automatically then become a part of the highway bill that goes to the Senate so that as it is considered in the Senate will it be as one complete bill in the Senate?

Mr. MOAKLEY. No; it goes over separately. The Senate joins them.

Mr. WALKER. I see. So, in other words, when it goes over to the other body, it will go over—

Mr. MOAKLEY. The Senate also has to vote twice.

Mr. WALKER. It will go over as two separate resolutions; is that correct?

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is right.

Mr. WALKER. All right.

Now, it is my understanding that when it gets to the other body that one person in the other body objecting to the consideration of the separate resolution on 55 can kill the whole thing. So what that means is it has to be brought up by unanimous consent, so even though we have voted here to take it up, the fact is that one person standing up can kill the whole process.

What I would like to know is whether or not there have been any discussions with people over there about being that one person who is going to stand up and object to consideration and whether or not we might expect that to be the methodology by which this issue will become separated out and we will not, even if we vote in this

body, have a chance to have the full thing enacted.

Mr. MOAKLEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman at the microphone knows that many actions taken in this House have to be taken unilaterally; we cannot figure out what the Senate is going to do on most every piece of legislation. We thought this would be the fairest way for the House to address it.

In fact, the bill could pass or it could be defeated here.

Mr. WALKER. Of course, the other way we could have considered it is an amendment in disagreement which would have assured that if we had then passed the 65-mile-an-hour speed limit, it would have gone to the other body as a full package and we would not have this danger of the separate action possibly being rejected in the other body.

Mr. MOAKLEY. If the gentleman will yield, that matter came up in the conference and it could not reach an agreement.

Mr. WALKER. I understand that but what I am saying is that we have created a situation which could ultimately be very unfair to the majority of this body who may vote to repeal the 55, because what we will do is we will have had a vote in both bodies basically to repeal 55, and then we will have the whole matter killed because one person can kill the process that is being set up in this rule.

What I am suggesting is that is not a fair process. That is an unfair process when we in fact set in place a process where one person can stop the whole procedure from going forward. What I would like to know is whether or not under the agreement that has been arrived at whether we can be assured that one person is not going to stop this process on the other side and that no one in this body or no one's staffs in this body have been in touch with other Members over there about perhaps objecting to it.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman did not imply that someone in the conference or part of the conference, in either body, was attempting to set up something that might be unfair to the Members of either body.

Mr. WALKER. I am implying that; yes, because it seems to me—

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman probably will not yield to me then because I tell you, I resent that greatly.

What we did was to try and reach an agreement with the other body. The ones who supported, Senator SYMMS, whose amendment it is, had asked us for one, special consideration: That we separately vote not on something we

might like but on exactly what he offered in the other body and was passed by the other body. That is exactly what we are doing, and then we arranged it also so that there would be no attempt at intimidation or any thought of that; that we would vote on the conference report first, and then take up the speed limit.

The agreement is that if this concurrent resolution to increase the speed limit is defeated, it would die right here, and if it is passed, it would go to the other body and would be accepted over there and I believe that over in the other body they will accept whatever the House states—

Mr. WALKER. I will yield to the gentleman again in just a moment, but if the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time, the gentleman can allay many of my fears on this matter if he could give me an assurance that the members of the conference nor any members of their staff have been in touch with the other body suggesting that someone over there ought to object to the unanimous consent request. Can the gentleman give me that assurance?

Mr. HOWARD. I believe that it was believed that it was not necessary to speak to all the other Members of the other body; that they would accept the honesty and decency and straightforwardness of this procedure. I, who am perhaps the strongest against that, going over to the other body, would be over there if need be to do everything I can to have them accept what the House does today much as I may disagree with it.

Mr. WALKER. There have been no such discussions; is the gentleman telling me?

Mr. HOWARD. It did not come up because we did not have the mindset to think that this kind of a thing might even be thought of.

Mr. WALKER. But, there have been no such discussions; is the gentleman assuring me?

□ 1500

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] could allay a lot of my fears if he could give me an assurance that the members of the conference nor any members of their staff have been in touch with the other body suggesting that someone over there ought to object to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOWARD. I believe that it was believed that it was not necessary to speak to all of the other Members of the other body, that they would accept the honesty and decency and straightforwardness of this procedure, and I, who am perhaps the strongest against that going over to the other body in it would be over there if need be to do everything that I can to have



them accept what the House does today, much as I may disagree with it.

Mr. WALKER. There have been no such discussions, is the gentleman telling me?

Mr. HOWARD. It did not come up, because we did not have the mindset to think that this kind of a thing might even be thought of.

Mr. WALKER. But there have been no such discussions, is the gentleman assuring me?

Mr. HOWARD. As far as I know, there was no need for any discussion of that. All the statements were that what the House does today—

Mr. WALKER. I would like to nail it down. There have been no such discussions? Am I hearing that no such discussions have taken place?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I would reiterate what the distinguished chairman has said. There has been an agreement that we will abide by what happens on this vote today, and we will send it over there. I believe, and it is my understanding, I was a party to it, that there is a good-faith agreement here that whatever happens here today will be abided by by the Senate as well. So the vote here today will determine that we are either going to have the 65 option or we are not going to have it. I know of absolutely no effort to circumvent this good-faith agreement. It is a solid good-faith agreement.

Mr. WALKER. And if in fact we adopt the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit in the House, it is the understanding of both gentlemen that that will go to the Senate as a package even though it is in separate resolutions. It will go as a package and they would expect that no one will break apart that package in the Senate, and that we will have in fact agreed to the 65.

Mr. HOWARD. Absolutely.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] says absolutely. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] agrees.

Mr. SHUSTER. That is right.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I want to emphasize what I said earlier. This is a fair rule, and it deserves a "yes" vote. It brings both the highway conference report and the speed limit issue before the House and gives the House a chance to vote on each one. I think it is a well-constructed, fair rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I take great personal pride in serving as the floor manager on this matter. The highway bill is an important achievement for this Congress. The legislation is essential to

completion of the Interstate Highway System. Many vital projects, and thousands of jobs, are at stake on today's vote.

For myself, and my colleagues in the Massachusetts congressional delegation, today's vote marks the successful completion of a long and difficult fight to obtain adequate funding to build a third harbor tunnel in Boston and to make desperately needed improvements in the highway system that carries motor vehicle traffic through downtown Boston.

The compromise that the Massachusetts delegation submitted to the conferees has been agreed to. It proposes a fair and reasonable cost for the Federal Government, and assures our State of the needed funding, to undertake this massive and badly needed project.

I would like to thank the bipartisan leadership of the committee for their support and encouragement for this project.

Mr. Speaker, today's vote is only the beginning. Now that we are funding the Boston highway improvements, the difficult and sensitive task of planning and construction begins. I intend to continue working on this project to assure that the project, is implemented with the maximum input from affected communities and sensitivity to their concerns and needs.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. This is a fair rule and an important bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 124, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 124, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 17, 1987, at page H1333.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within

which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and personal satisfaction that we bring to the House the conference report of H.R. 2, the surface transportation and uniform relocation assistance act of 1987.

We believe we have worked out a fair and reasonable compromise on the legislation. It's not everything we wanted; however, we were able to include many of the same provisions that the House agreed to on January 21 and also address many other members' concerns.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2 is a 5-year bill authorizing Federal-aid funds for highway, highway safety, and public transportation programs. The fourth title, the uniform relocation assistance amendments of 1987, provides for the fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal or federally-assisted programs or projects.

The highway title authorizes approximately \$13.6 billion a year from the highway trust fund. Funding to complete the Interstate System is provided through fiscal year 1993 along with continued funding for the minimum one-half percent States. In exchange for funding the interstate 4R discretionary program at \$200 million per year, the House conferees agreed to continue the existing interstate 4R formula. The bridge discretionary program was increased to \$225 million for high-cost bridge projects.

In addition, the conference agreement provides \$100 million to be added to the unobligated balance of current State entitlements under the interstate transfer-transit program in order to offset anticipated future inflation in transportation construction costs. A pilot toll road program is established allowing Federal-aid funds to be used in the construction of seven toll facilities. The conference agreement also phases in the use of allocated funds in calculating the 85-percent minimum allocation for the States.

Title II of the legislation continues Federal requirements to encourage and enhance highway safety. Since the enactment of the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit in 1974, there has been a considerable reduction in fatality rates on the Nation's highways. The agreement continues to recognize and support the importance of the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit. However, in order to expedite consideration of the conference report, the conferees have agreed to a separate vote on a provi-

sion which would allow States to increase their speed limits to 65 miles per hour on rural segments of interstate highways. House Concurrent Resolution 77 will be considered immediately after passage of the conference report. A separate vote on this issue will give Members an opportunity to express their continued support on this very important safety-related issue. Title II also continues the safety belt and alcohol incentive grant programs with minor modifications.

Title III of the bill modifies slightly the current structure of the mass transit program to provide a "blending" of the section 3 amounts over \$1 billion. Half of the "blended" amounts will be allocated to the section 3 discretionary program and half to a formula capital program.

Authorizations for the mass transit program are about \$3.5 billion per year for the period 1987-91. The section three discretionary capital program, which is funded by the penny-a-gallon gasoline tax, will be allocated for traditional public transportation purposes. The buy America provision is also strengthened by increasing the bid price differential for rolling stock to 25 percent and phasing in a domestic content requirement of 60 percent by the end of the fifth year. Existing domestic manufacturers are grandfathered under existing regulations for the term of this legislation.

Title IV, the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987, seeks to achieve a degree of uniformity not achieved in the original 1970 act. It would do so by vesting responsibility in a lead agency—the Department of Transportation—for development of Government-wide regulations assuring consistency of coverage in terms of eligibility and benefits provided to persons displaced as a direct result of Federal or federally assisted programs or projects. A State certification process is also provided in the bill which will result in more effective implementation of the act.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight several additional issues that I consider quite important. With respect to the Interstate 4R Program, we believe that discretionary Interstate 4R funding is appropriate for upgrading I-5 and I-405 in the counties of Los Angeles and Orange in California, I-80 in the State of Pennsylvania, and I-490 in Monroe County, NY.

Another important issue that I would like to clarify is that funding for the demonstration project in Wayne County, MI, is provided for the Ecorse road project. The north line road project in the bill is under construction and the funding provided is intended only for the Ecorse road project.

On the section dealing with bridge projects, I would like to cite that this

section makes the Benjamin Franklin Bridge between Philadelphia, PA, and Camden, NJ, eligible for bridge replacement or rehabilitation funds. The Benjamin Franklin Bridge is on the Federal-aid system. It is directly connected to the Interstate Highway System both in Pennsylvania and in New Jersey and is a critical link in the efficient operation of the Federal-aid system and is therefore among those bridges intended for high priority assistance from the Secretary's discretionary fund.

When pilot projects involving toll roads are being considered by the Department of Transportation under the terms of the conference report, one that should receive high priority and careful consideration as a project is Georgia State Route 400.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of highway and transit funding in the States has become more critical with each passing day. The impending loss of the highway construction season will result in a significant loss of jobs. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and vote to pass this legislation today. We need this bill, and we need it now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, The Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

On January 21, the House passed H.R. 2 by the overwhelming vote of 401 to 20. At that time we were concerned that if the Congress was unable to enact highway and transit legislation quickly, the 1987 construction season would be in jeopardy and 813,000 jobs would hang in the balance.

With that sense of urgency, we proceeded to conference with the other body to work out a compromise piece of legislation. After less than a month of complex negotiations, we are pleased to bring back a conference report that puts America's highway and transit programs back in business.

I believe the House conferees have done a good job of representing the interests of the members of this body. The conference report provides a 5-year, \$68 billion extension of the Nation's mass transit programs. It also extends highway safety programs, and provides uniform standards for the relocation assistance of those displaced by federally assisted construction projects.

The conference agreement provides sufficient funding to complete the Interstate 4R, primary, secondary, urban, and bridge programs in current law; creates an Interstate 4R discretionary account to fund high cost re-

habilitation projects on the interstate; continues the current mass transit formula and discretionary programs; and extends the highway trust fund and highway user fees for 5 years to fund the highway and discretionary mass transit programs.

During the course of our negotiations with the other body, several contentious issues evolved. Among these issues were: Buy America, highway beautification, toll financing of Federal-aid highway projects, the funding of demonstration projects, and the speed limit. While prolonged discussion and debate of any one of these issues could have resulted in serious delays in reaching a conference agreement, the conferees recognized the urgent need for the bill and quickly worked out their differences.

It was in this spirit of negotiation and compromise, that the chairman of our committee, Mr. HOWARD, removed a major obstacle for consideration of this conference report. As you are undoubtedly aware, the speed limit became perhaps the most controversial issue of the conference. Chairman HOWARD has very strong personal views in favor of maintaining the current speed limit. He could have tried to use the current highway/transit funding crisis as a leverage on the Senate to drop its provision which would allow States to raise their speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates. However, he has chosen a better course of action, one that allows us to pass this urgently needed highway/transit legislation without further delay, and one which will allow the House to consider separately, and work its will on, the extremely emotional and controversial issue of the national speed limit. I would like to publicly commend the chairman for his personal efforts to resolve this controversial issue.

These programs are vital to the Nation's economy. I am pleased that our expeditious action will enable these programs to get back on track. I only hope the administration will also recognize the need to reauthorize these programs quickly, and quickly sign this conference report into law.

In closing, I would like to highlight some of the benefits this bill provides to my home State of Arkansas. This bill will provide Arkansas over \$108 million in fiscal year 1987 for highway formula programs which include the interstate construction; interstate resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction [4R]; primary, secondary, urban, bridge, hazard elimination, and railroad highway crossing programs.

The conference report continues the minimum one-half percent interstate construction apportionment to States that have completed their Interstate Program. These funds may be used in



interstate rehabilitation projects, or transferred for use on primary highways. The continuation of this provision provides over \$13 million per fiscal year to Arkansas.

The conference report also continues and expands the Minimum Allocation Program, which provides States with at least 85 percent of the amounts they contribute to the highway trust fund. This program provides an additional \$14.9 million to Arkansas for fiscal year 1987, and will be calculated annually in the future.

In sum, this means that Arkansas will receive a total of over \$123 million under the basic Federal-Aid Program in fiscal year 1987, exclusive of demonstration projects and any discretionary grants the State may receive. Funding in each of fiscal years 1988-91 would be roughly the same for the highway formula programs.

The conference report also contains a provision authorizing a \$45 million project over the next 5 years to accelerate construction of U.S. Highway 71 as a four-lane highway, with another \$45 million project authorized for U.S. Highway 71 in Missouri. Arkansas will receive \$36 million or 80 percent of their project's cost in new Federal funding. Arkansas will be required to match the grant with \$9 million or 20 percent of the project cost.

The conference report also contains a provision which allows Arkansas to use interstate construction funds for the planning, design, and construction of Highway 71. Although the State has completed all its interstate segments and its interstate funds must normally be spent on I-4R work, the conference report gives Arkansas the option of using its interstate funds on Highway 71.

The conference report further designates Highway 71 as a priority project. This means that Arkansas may use any combination of its normally apportioned funds, including interstate 4-R, primary, urban, secondary, and bridge funds for the construction of Highway 71. This will provide Arkansas with maximum flexibility to expedite construction of this route.

Also included in the conference report is an authorization of a \$8.5 million project at Fort Smith, which involves widening a segment of the highway connecting Westark Community College and the new central mall, and improving signalization on the segment. The conference report provides \$6.8 million or 80 percent of the project cost in new Federal funds to be matched by \$1.7 million, or 20 percent of the project cost, in State funds.

The conference report also contains an authorization for four grade separations on a four-lane bypass at Jonesboro. The report provides \$9.84 million, which is 80 percent of the project cost, in new Federal funds to be matched by \$2.46 million or 20 percent

in State funds. The report also provides an authorization for preliminary engineering on a bridge project at lock and dam No. 4 near Pine Bluff. The report provides \$1.6 million, which is 80 percent of the estimated cost, in new Federal funds to be matched by \$400,000, or 20 percent, in State funds.

It should be noted that all of these funds come out of the highway trust fund and therefore do not add to the Federal deficit.

The conference report also directs the Secretary of Transportation, in cooperation with Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, to study the feasibility of constructing a highway from Shreveport, LA, to Texarkana, Fort Smith, Fayetteville, AR, and Carthage and Kansas City, MO. A report on the study's results is to be submitted to Congress within 1 year after the report's enactment.

Another provision of interest to Arkansas is one that will allow the States to use bridge replacement and rehabilitation funds to construct bridges to replace ferry boat service, low water crossings, bridges destroyed before 1965, and bridges rendered obsolete by Army Corps of Engineer projects.

In summary, this conference report represents a fair compromise of the positions contained in the House and Senate passed bills. It provides for the construction of the final links and forms the closing chapter of the Nation's greatest public works project—the Interstate Highway System. The conference report also sets the stage for the post-Interstate Highway Program of the 1990's.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of this conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. Let me say, first, that the conferees on this bill were engaged with four different Senate committees in revolving differences between our bills. The issues before us were difficult, varied, and complex. On balance, I firmly believe that an outstanding job was done in representing the views of this body.

Title I of the bill, the highway title, provides funds necessary to complete the greatest public works project ever undertaken by any nation, our Interstate Highway System, begun in 1956 with legislation fostered by President Eisenhower. This bill will finally assure its completion. I am particularly pleased that in so doing, this bill assures completion of the Century Freeway, and high occupancy vehicle lanes and other work on the Harbor Freeway.

We provide \$2.815 billion in funding each year for the Interstate 4R Program, used generally to reconstruct the system as more and more seg-

ments reach their design life, and to add capacity to the existing system. In those States where the need for primary funds exceeds that for 4R money, we are introducing flexibility to shift 20 percent of their 4R funds to their primary system.

Our urban and secondary programs are extended at \$750 million and \$600 million a year respectively, and the 85-percent minimum Allocation Program is extended and made permanent, with the scope for calculating the program expanded to include allocated as well as apportioned programs. Those allocated programs not included in the calculations in fiscal year 1987 will be phased in in fiscal year 1989, except for California, with respect for which the full phase-in takes effect in fiscal year 1990. This will allow California to receive interstate discretionary and emergency relief funds in fiscal year 1988, without having their 85-percent minimum allocation reduced in fiscal year 1988. It is, of course, my hope and intent that California apply for and receive substantial and significant amounts of interstate discretionary funds for the Harbor and Century Freeways, and other interstate routes in fiscal year 1988.

Those States with unobligated balances and which have utilized all their obligational authority in a given year, along with their August 1 reapportionment, will be given sufficient additional authority to obligate 5 percent of their backlog, except that nationally the amount of obligational authority distributed may not exceed the total needed to obligate 2½ percent of the Nation's backlog. Because California has such a large backlog I would expect that California will be among the most significant beneficiaries of this provision.

With respect to total obligational authority, let me say how much I truly regret the low ceiling provided for in this bill, only \$12.35 billion each year. This compares with a ceiling anticipated for fiscal year 1986, when we passed the 1982 Surface Transportation Assistance Act, of \$14.45 billion. The reality of the program pales in contrast to our intentions when the fuels tax was increased 4 years ago. Despite the fact that our Federal-aid highway needs exceed \$20 billion a year, that this is a User Fee Program with all funding generated from taxes raised purely for transportation purposes, and that the revenues so raised could support a higher program level, we had no choice in crafting this legislation and working out our differences in conference, then to report back to the House with these obligation levels. I don't expect them to be cut further.

Also in this bill is a relatively minor amount of funding, less than 1.3 percent of the total highway budget authority, that is made available for spe-

cific projects, enabling us to be sensitive to local needs. Among these projects is \$37 million in additional budget authority plus over \$22 million to be drawn down from secretarial discretionary accounts, for road improvements surrounding the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area which will ease congestion resulting from port-related traffic. Also included is funding for the design and engineering of the widening of Sepulveda Boulevard under the LAX runway. Traffic in this tunnel will almost certainly increase when the Century Freeway is completed in the 1990's. Also included is funding for highway 86 in Riverside county, so that we may accelerate our efforts to improve this crucial route and the safety of the motoring public who use this road. I am also pleased that we have provided funding for a demonstration project in Anaheim, road improvements surrounding Ontario airport which will help allow the capacity of that facility to increase dramatically, and so reduce the demand for growth at LAX, Long Beach, and John Wayne airports, and design preliminary engineering, and the implementation of environmental mitigation measures related to projects needed to improve access to and reduce congestion on route 17 in Alameda county. Finally, I am pleased that we have been able to include funding for a grade separation on Alameda Street, in Compton, CA.

Funding levels in the transit title are also regrettable low. The penny tax that goes into the mass transit account of the highway trust fund can support an annual program of \$1.8 billion. Yet, funding for the Section 3 Program in fiscal year 1986 will be about \$1.1 billion, with increases phased up to \$1.4 billion by fiscal year 1991. Fifty percent of all funding in excess of \$1 billion will be apportioned according to the section 9 formula, so that all urbanized areas will now receive capital funding out of the Transit Trust Fund. Fifty percent of the fund still distributed on a discretionary basis will be used: 40 percent for new rail starts and extensions, 40 percent for rail modernization, 10 percent for bus capital purposes, and 10 percent for any of these purposes.

An effort is made in this bill to assure that the trust fund money is wisely used. Criteria are established for the distribution of new start funds. The Secretary will report to Congress each year with her recommendation of how new start funds should be distributed, and her recommendations should reflect amounts named in full funding contracts and letters of intent.

With respect to the Los Angeles metro rail, the Secretary is expected to complete work on a supplemental environmental impact statement within 5 months from the date of enactment, and then enter into a full

funding contract within 30 days to complete minimal operable segments 1 and 2. A funding schedule is specified which must be included in the contract should the project proceed with local funding. Such funding will be reimbursed, with interest, by fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that the transit formula programs are extended at a level of \$2.1 billion a year, and that communities will be entitled to continue expending a portion of this funding for operating assistance.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that enactment of this bill is needed and needed quickly. While this conference report may not, in all candor, be everything each of us would like, it is sound legislation given the budgetary constraints within which we had to work. It is a bill that each of us may proudly support. It is a bill we must have to get our Nation's transportation programs back on track.

□ 1510

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], who has been a leader in the surface transportation area for a long time and is the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. Indeed, we bring to the floor today a conference report which represents many, many significant compromises. It is not everything I would have liked to have seen, but it is a compromise with the other body and one that I think we can proudly support.

We compromised on the interstate cost estimate. We compromised on the discretionary funding. We compromised on the budget levels. We compromised with the other body on toll road provisions. We compromised in permitting a vote on the speed limit here on this floor.

We receded on highway beautification. We compromised on buy-America. Indeed, this represents a very legitimate compromise with the other body.

I would like to focus particularly today, Mr. Speaker, on the fact that we are faced with an urgency here, an urgency to pass this legislation because if this legislation is not quickly passed and signed into law, America will lose its construction season. Indeed, many States will not be able to go to construction, and we will find ourselves in a situation where billions of dollars paid into the highway trust fund by the users of America's highways through the gas tax will be in that fund. Indeed, there is a \$10.8 billion surplus in the fund today, and yet the money will not be spent, will not

be spent because we and the administration failed to act. So it is critical that we pass this legislation, and have it signed into law so indeed we can get on with the construction season.

Let me emphasize further, we are talking here about 813,000 construction jobs across America which will be in jeopardy if we do not quickly see this legislation signed into law.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I was quite disappointed at the very misleading document circulated by the Federal Highway Administration yesterday and today which claims that under this legislation 47 of the 50 States will lose money, highway money as compared to what they were receiving under the old 1982 law. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is true. It is true that the States will receive less money than they were receiving under the 1982 law.

Why? Because we are complying with the Budget Act, we are complying with the budget requirements. Let me be specific; let me be precise.

Under the 1982 act we provided an original obligational ceiling of \$14.5 billion a year. Then we eventually cut that to \$13.2 billion, and what we have in this bill today is a further cut in order to comply with the budget requirements to \$12.3 billion. So if we are taking \$1 billion out of the spending, obviously, most States are going to get less money. So I am shocked that the Federal Highway Administration would take this and twist this and claim that the real reason we are losing this money is because of these terrible demonstration projects.

Let me deal more precisely with these so-called terrible demonstration projects. Ladies and gentlemen, the total cost of all the demonstration projects in the bill represents 1.3 percent of the bill.

□ 1520

But let me let you in on a little secret: The total cost of the discretionary money, the slush fund which the Secretary of Transportation has to spend as she sees fit downtown, is not 1.3 percent, or 2 or 4 or 5, it is over 6 percent.

So if we want to talk about using simplistic terms, talk about pork barrel—I know it is a very fetching thing to do; it is so nice and simplistic, to take cheap shots about these terrible projects as though Members of Congress are not qualified to know what projects are important to their district.

Somehow, the faceless, nameless bureaucrats downtown, they are qualified. They are qualified not to spend just 1.3 percent, but they are qualified to spend over 6 percent of these moneys; and I suggest that this argument simply does not wash.



I further emphasize that in the conference we agreed, the House conferees agreed, recognizing that the demonstration project issue was a contentious issue, we agreed to cut 50 percent of the funding for those demonstration projects, 50 percent of the new funding for demonstration projects was cut, so we certainly have gone halfway.

So for somebody to cavalierly continue to attack demonstration projects, even though we cut them in half, cut the funding in half, I suggest that really is not fair; it is not responsible, and particularly when you consider, in light of the fact that the Secretary's slush fund represents more than three times the amount of money for demonstration projects, projects which have been justified by Members of Congress, badly needed projects—in fact, I have to suggest there is a certain chutzpah involved here, in the faceless, nameless bureaucrats saying that Members of Congress, House and Senate, do not have a right to identify important projects back in their districts, even though those projects only represent 1.3 percent of the bill.

But the faceless, nameless bureaucrats, they have a right to decide how the taxpayers' money should be spent—that simply does not wash. So I urge my colleagues to support overwhelmingly this conference report. It is badly needed. There is a crisis out there across America as far as the need for improved highways in this country of ours, and we need this legislation badly, and I can say that Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, we bring to this floor legitimate compromises which deserve the support of every Member if he is willing to look in depth at the substance of what we bring and not simply use cheap-shot slogans to try to attack a bill which really is deserving of the support of every Member of this body.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman HOWARD, the committee's ranking member, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and all other members of the conference committee on H.R. 2 for their expeditious completion of the conference. Our States are anxiously awaiting final approval of the conference report on H.R. 2 so that they can get on with the awarding of construction grants and proceeding with other highway-related projects. The conference committee's action should save thousands of construction jobs this spring across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that some of the Members are aware that, as late as yesterday morning, there was considerable concern that final approval by the conferees of this docu-

ment was being delayed because of what some have called "the mudflap flap." Basically, that term pertains to the disagreement between the House and Senate over the issuance of regulations for splash and spray suppression devices, commonly referred to as mudflaps.

I am happy to report that "the mudflap flap" is over and that the House and Senate have agreed to a compromise on this important matter. Under the compromise, the Secretary must issue a final rule requiring the use of splash and spray suppression devices unless she finds that there is no available technology that will significantly improve driver visibility and significantly reduce splash and spray. Furthermore, the devices must be tested under both real world conditions and in the laboratory. This agreement should also improve highway safety.

While this may seem to be a very small issue to some, it is a life-or-death issue to small manufacturers of mudflaps nationwide, including a number in my congressional district in Ohio. The language would permit these small manufacturers to compete on a more level playing field with industry giants to develop and market mudflaps that truly work, both in the laboratory and on the road.

I strongly support the compromise language on mudflaps and am glad that this issue has been resolved without delaying the conference report further.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. H.R. 2 provides authorizations from the highway trust fund for fiscal years 1987-91. Antideficit provisions governing trust fund authorizations required reductions in highway spending commitments beginning on October 1, 1986, since action was not taken to provide further funding before the adjournment of the 99th Congress. Continued funding for the building and maintenance of our Nation's highway system is an important national objective. Therefore, on March 17, 1987, House and Senate conferees approved the revenue title of H.R. 2, which extends the highway trust fund, including the mass transit account, and the highway-related taxes which support the fund.

Title 5 extends the present law highway trust fund excise taxes, and the authority to spend from the trust fund, for 5 years through September 30, 1993. The highway trust fund would be updated to reflect new authorizations in H.R. 2, including university transportation research centers.

The conference agreement includes two technical amendments which had been included in the House bill relating to the retail excise tax on trucks and trailers. The House conferees also

accepted a Senate modification which relates to the computation of the excise tax on trucks and trailers on sales in which the manufacturer collects the tax. The amendment also contains a Senate provision which subjects certain trucks with Canadian or Mexican registration to 75 percent of the otherwise applicable heavy vehicle use tax imposed on United States registered trucks.

In order to continue the necessary funding for support of our Nation's highways, I urge my colleagues to approve the conference report on H.R. 2.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I think we should give the States the option to raise their speed limit. A speed limit that is supported by the public is more likely to be adhered to by the public. Because the current 55-mile-per-hour speed limit does not allow for variances in traffic and road conditions, millions of citizens are disobeying this law. In fact probably 40 percent of motorists today ignore the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

We originally mandated the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit because of the gasoline shortage, although most of the rationale for keeping it concerns safety. In recent years many safety measures have been taken by States to limit the hazards of highway travel. Many States, including Texas, have mandated safety belts use and now have stronger laws against drunk driving. I believe that State governments are just as concerned about highway safety as Congress and are capable of making responsible decisions on whether or not it is appropriate to raise the speed limit in certain areas.

This measure does not mandate raising the speed limit, it just gives that option to the States.

I hope my colleagues will support this reasonable change in the law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for purposes of a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Main Avenue Bridge in Cleveland is in despicable condition; one of the neediest bridges in the country. Is it the intent of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation that bridge discretionary funds be applied to completion of the remaining priority bridge repair, the Main Avenue Bridge project initiated with bridge discretionary assistance on January 31, 1984, pursuant to provisions of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, the gentlewoman is correct. It is the intent of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation that work on this bridge be completed with bridge repair discretionary funds as intended in 1982.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to, personally, thank the chairman and members of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the full committee chairman; and I certainly want to support the bill and the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her remarks, and before I recognize my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], I want to get something on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks and my deep respect to Chairman HOWARD, to Congressman HAMMERSCHMIDT, to Congressman SHUSTER for their effective work on this bill, and to my dear friend and former colleague, Gene Snyder, for the work he did in helping to put the initial bill together last year, and finally the House Public Works staff I think is the best in the business, and they, too, have my thanks.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Chairman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, in urging the adoption of the revenue title of H.R. 2, which provides a 5-year extension of highway trust fund authorizations.

H.R. 2 is very similar to H.R. 3192, a bill that passed the House during the 99th Congress by a vote of 345 to 34. Had it not been for the heavy legislative schedule in the waning days of that Congress, the bill now before us would have been enacted last year.

The revenue title in H.R. 2 provides more specifically for a 5-year extension of the current highway excise taxes and highway trust fund. The conferees also agreed to a House provision which treats long-term lessors the same as retailer purchasers with respect to truck and trailer excise taxes. This is, in my opinion, a fair and equitable change in the law.

As far as I know, there is not disagreement on the revenue provisions of the highway bill conference report. I urge my colleagues to vote for the continued funding and maintenance of our Nation's highway system.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], a distinguished member of the committee.

□ 1530

Mr. CLINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize, nobody can overemphasize, the urgency of the need to act on this vitally needed legislation. We have a crisis in the country, as previous speakers have indicated. We are in danger of losing an entire construction season with all of the jobs, literally thousands of jobs that will be lost if we delay almost 1 day more. I want to reiterate some of the remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, who discussed the brouhaha that has been generated over the question of demonstration projects. I think that there are many misconceptions about this which have been exacerbated by the media in many instances and by those who would be opposed to this legislation.

The fact is, as Mr. SHUSTER has indicated, that 1.3 percent of the total cost of this bill, the total authorization of this bill is dedicated to demonstration projects.

A second point that should be borne in mind is that this bill requires cost sharing on the part of the States for the demonstration projects. So it is erroneous to say that Congress is arbitrarily forcing projects down the throats of resisting States. The media and those who have argued against the demonstration projects consider that projects that are designated by Congress are somehow evil, pork barrel, frivolous, unnecessary, but projects designated by State governments or indeed by the Secretary of Transportation through the discretionary funding which has been referred to are somehow meritorious and all vital.

Well, the fact is, fellow Members, no Member is going to promote a project that is frivolous or unnecessary. Every project that is funded under this demonstration area is a vitally needed project. No one clearly is going to be pushing an unneeded project anywhere in this country because the needs are so overwhelmingly great. The Public Works Committee, I know from serving on it, carefully considers the requests of all Members who come to it with requests for projects, and makes a judgment in each case based upon the available resources we have and also based upon the urgency of the need as it is presented by the individual Member.

So it is a selective process, and only those projects that meet those dual tests pass.

Mr. Speaker, there is an infrastructure crisis in this country. We are finding ourselves in very bad shape, not just with regard to highways, but with all areas of our infrastructure. We have taken one step, earlier in this Congress, with the passage of the Clean Water Act. We can take the

second step today by passing this conference report.

Over 1,200 miles of our Interstate System each year fall into the category of having extended beyond their useful life. They need repair, renovation, and upgrading. And they need it now!

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the conference report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. I also especially thank and express my appreciation to Chairman HOWARD for the way he has conducted this legislation on the floor and also the subcommittee chairmen for the fine job that they have done. I will be supporting this legislation.

But I have a question I would like to pose to the chairmen. It is essentially this: Does this section allow flexibility of park and ride locations? Can their locations be changed without the loss of funding under section 139, subsection A?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is "yes," provided that the \$84 million limit is not exceeded.

Mr. MICA. One more question: Can the full interchanges be constructed versus direct access connectors to HOV?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, the answer is yes, provided the \$84 million limit is not exceeded.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BOSCO].

Mr. BOSCO. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, recently the White House and media have talked about the so-called pork barrel projects in this bill. It's always an easy, boilerplate story. There's a presumption that those of us who face the voters every 2 years, who knock on doors to ask for votes, who are held accountable for bad roads and traffic snarlups by our local newspapers that somehow we should step aside and stay out of the decisions on what projects should be built and where. That somehow, it's better to give the money to State bureaucrats to parcel out because they're insulated from the politics of it all. That when they make the decisions it's planning, when we do it's pork barreling.

Well I, for one, don't enjoy elections so much that I want to come back here and let someone else make all the decisions. For over a year, Congress-



woman **BOXER** and I have worked with local citizen groups to develop one of the so-called pork barrel projects in this bill—a unique plan to buy 52 miles of railroad right-of-way, install a high speed bus lane, and relieve hours of grid lock traffic for thousands of commuters traveling from the Golden Gate Bridge into the Redwood country. Every one of these people would rather be spending time with their families than gnashing their teeth in sweltering traffic and cursing do-nothing politicians.

If we had waited for the glacial State planning process, these people would be stalled in traffic 10 years from now. It takes pork barreling to get them home to their kids a half hour earlier, then I'm a proud pork barrel.

As for politics, handing funds to the States doesn't shield it. During our last administration, our highway director didn't believe in highways at all. Her politics was that it was time for Americans to end their love affair with the automobile and take buses and bicycles to work instead. And our present Governor has appointed all eight highway commissioners from his own party. They are all fine, dedicated people, but the point is, let's not fall for the rhetoric that Members of Congress are any more political than the host of others who help with the highway planning process.

Only 1 percent of this bill's spending is in special projects. That certainly is not an outrageous intrusion by those of us who are elected to make these decisions.

**Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN].

**Mr. McEWEN.** Mr. Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Transportation, Mr. **HOWARD**, for the purpose of clarifying section 205 of the conference report on H.R. 2, known as the "mud flap" provisions.

**Mr. Speaker,** I have prepared a technical interpretation of this provision.

**Mr. Speaker,** I would ask unanimous consent that this language be inserted in the **RECORD** at this time.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. **KILDEE**). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

**Mr. McEWEN.** Mr. Speaker, section 205 of the bill amends section 414 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 in order to assure that if final minimum standards are promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the performance and installation of splash and spray suppression devices for use on truck tractors, trailers, and semitrailers, such standards must significantly reduce both splash and spray and significantly improve the visibility of drivers.

Through section 205, the Secretary need not promulgate such standards if she has determined that there is no available technology that can significantly reduce splash and spray and significantly improve visibility of drivers as demonstrated during testing on highways at test facilities and in laboratories, taking into account possible wind and rain conditions. The Secretary must determine whether the unaided human eye can clearly perceive a significant reduction in both splash and spray and whether the driver's visibility is significantly improved as a result of the use of the devices which may be proposed by such standards.

Further, any laboratory test must measure the effectiveness of proposed devices in the presence of crosswinds and rain. In other words, any laboratory test must simulate all of the real road conditions that a splash and spray suppression device must deal with.

The purpose of section 205 of this bill is to assure that any standards promulgated will result in a significant reduction of both splash and spray and significantly improve the visibility of drivers over the plain mud flap that is used on trucks today. The American Trucking Association estimates that the cost to retrofit existing vehicles would be between \$837 million and \$1.181 billion. The annual cost added to the purchase price of new vehicles will be \$18 to \$21 million for tractors and \$44.7 million for trailers. Combined annual maintenance and increased fuel costs would range between \$67 and \$106.7 million. All of these costs will be passed on to the consumers of the products being transported by the trucking industry. The American consumer should not be forced to bare these costs if the proposed devices do not significantly improve safety on our highways. Congress is unwilling to impose such costs without accruing safety benefits in the real world commensurate with these costs. Any standards promulgated by the Secretary should be practicable, provide objective criteria, and meet the need for motor vehicle safety.

**Mr. Speaker,** I know that you have had an opportunity to review this interpretation. In a nutshell, this provision seeks to clarify the intent of Congress to the Secretary of Transportation regarding proposed rulemaking for splash and spray suppression devices. We want to make sure that, if a standard is promulgated, it will result in a significant improvement in safety in the real world on our highways. It is not sufficient to have a standard based on laboratory results; any standard must be supported by meeting the criteria set forth in section 205 as demonstrated on roads and at test facilities under wind and rain conditions. And, any standard promulgated must assure the public that it works, that we will significantly reduce splash and spray from trucks.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. McEWEN.** I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** I thank the gentleman for yielding.

**Mr. Speaker,** I agree with the interpretation of the gentleman in connection with section 205.

**Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

**Mr. McEWEN.** I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

**Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.** I thank the gentleman for yielding.

**Mr. Speaker,** I want to concur with the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee and also agree with the interpretation of the gentleman on section 205.

**Mr. SHUSTER.** Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. McEWEN.** I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

**Mr. SHUSTER.** I thank the gentleman for yielding.

**Mr. Speaker,** I too have studied this language and concur with it.

**Mr. McEWEN.** Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the vice chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member on the subcommittee from Pennsylvania.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. **RAHALL**].

**Mr. RAHALL.** Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

**Mr. Speaker,** I rise in strong support of this conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987, and I would like to extend my congratulations to the Public Works leadership for their extensive and excellent work on this bill.

This legislation is of vital importance to my home State of West Virginia as it extends authorizations for highways, highway safety and mass transportation. A provision of this legislation, which I authored in the Public Works Committee, authorizes \$17.6 million for the construction of the New River Parkway which will run along the New River Gorge in southern West Virginia. It is my hope that the parkway will promote recreation and tourism, as well as economic and industrial development in the southern region of my State and, thereby, provide a much needed boost to the economy of this area as we work to diversify and expand the economic base of the State.

At this time, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

**Mr. Speaker,** it is my understanding that the committee intends that the Secretary of Transportation assign priority in the use of discretionary bridge funds to the Sixth Street Bridge in Huntington, WV.

**Mr. ANDERSON.** If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. There is no doubt that the Sixth Street Bridge is in dire need of replacement. This bridge is the top priority under the discretionary bridge program for the West Virginia Department of Highways. Additionally, it has an extreme-

ly low rating factor of 3.83 and has met all other Federal criteria. The location study for the bridge has been completed and plans for the new bridge will be completed during fiscal year 1987.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the subcommittee chairman. The Sixth Street Bridge is the major link between West Virginia and Ohio in the Huntington area. It is vital to the transportation needs of the people in that area and to interstate commerce in the economically depressed tri-State region. It is imperative that this bridge receive funding under the discretionary program. Again, I would like to thank the chairman for his assistance in this matter.

□ 1540

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purposes of a colloquy with the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, I have a question regarding the effect of the Senate amendment concerning historic bridges that was included in the conference report that I would appreciate if you could clarify for me. There is an award-winning bridge that connects the cities of Pasco and Kennewick in my district that has been open to traffic since 1978. The bridge that it replaced has not yet been demolished and a local historic preservation group is attempting to preserve it. The local governments favor the demolition of the bridge because it is a hazard to navigation and a referendum on its demolition was overwhelmingly approved. My question is whether there is anything in the conference report that would require Washington State or any local government to accept responsibility for the preservation of the old bridge?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the answer is: No, there is not. The intent of the amendment is to give States and localities the flexibility to use funding from the bridge program for preservation efforts if they should so desire or if there is a responsible entity that agrees to maintain the bridge and assume all future legal and financial responsibility for it. The amendment in no way obliges State or local governments to initiate bridge preservation efforts nor does it limit the use of funds for bridge demolition when there is no entity that is willing and capable of taking responsibility for it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report. As a matter of fact, I would support it even without the demonstration projects or the 65-mile-an-hour issue.

My point should be raised during the hour of debate when we come to the 55/65 issue. I represent 58 counties out on the prairie, or what we call the wide open spaces. Obviously, I am for the 65-miles-per-hour speed limit.

But out in the wide open spaces, I would submit to my colleagues that the only person you see sometimes is that highway patrolman who pulls you over when you do 61 and then you get nailed. What happens in Kansas when you get nailed? Our Department of Transportation then reports, with 32 of the blue boxes on a randomly selected basis, what happens in Kansas and then we stand to lose funds.

I have empirical evidence at best, and some press reports, that that is not the case in the State of Maryland or Virginia or on the Beltway, which I think should properly be referred to as the Indianapolis 500 around here or on the "fun run" from New York to Florida.

In fact, they do not go 55. In fact, they go 65 or 70, and, in fact, it is not reported. How should it be reported? On a random basis. How is it reported? According to press reports, it is reported like this: on rainy days, on the upgrade of a hill or their highway patrol comes out and picks the patrol car right in front of the box. Maybe it is on a curve.

We have reports that fair is not fair. I would submit, if we lose the 65-mile-an-hour amendment, and if we go to 55, if that is the rule of the land, if that is the law of the land, let us make it fair and accurate all across this country.

We have buffalo that roam faster than 55 that would get ticketed in our country, whereas everybody in this country goes above the 55, according to this evidence, and DOT does not have the proper compliance procedure.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill when it left the House. I had hopes the conference committee would improve it. They did not.

What we have is a formula now before us where 47 States across this Union are going to lose money in their formula under the conference report that we are adopting here. Why? Because of pork.

Here it is. Page after page after page after page after page after page after page after page of pork. That may be 1.3 percent of the budget,

but in small print, it is one whale of a lot of pork.

What we are told here is the problem is that—the reason why we are losing the money is because it has to fit under the budget. Let me suggest to you that what they did was they fittted the pork under the budget so that we end up reducing the formula for everybody else.

What does that mean in my State? It means that 4 million people out of the 12 million people in my State are going to benefit from these demonstration projects, but the other two-thirds of the State do not get the benefit, even though they pay for it.

We are told then that the Secretary has a slush fund that is worth a lot of money. I suggest that I am not out here defending the Secretary's slush fund. We ought to put that into the formula, too.

If we put both into the formula; if we took away the pork and the Secretary's slush fund and put it in the formula, guess what? Forty-four States that now stand to lose money would get money.

That is right. Forty-four States that now stand to lose money would be made whole again and would get at least their 1986 authorization if we simply cut out the Secretary's slush fund and cut out all the pork.

I suggest that we would be better off with local people making these decisions, that they should decide the priorities rather than having some bureaucrats in Washington deciding them, rather than having them decided behind closed doors in Washington. What we ought to have is local people making these decisions so that a few do not benefit at the expense of the many.

The bottom line is that you are going to vote for a proposition here that will cut the funds to 47 of the 50 States. I suggest a better way would have been to give 44 States out of the 50 at least the same amount of money that they got last year.

That is not going to happen. This is not going to happen because we have a bill out here that robs people of the money that they are paying the slush fund in order to have page after page after page after page after page after page of pork. It is wrong. It is wrong, and I would suggest that, at least as one skunk at the garden party here, that a "no" vote is very much in order on this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and rise in strong support of the bill and ask him to join in a colloquy with me.

As the chairman knows, when both last year's H.R. 3129, and this year's H.R. 2 originally passed the House,



and I engaged in colloquys to assure that priority consideration be given to providing funds for the repair or replacement of the Southside Bridge in Charleston, WV, under the discretionary bridge account. This situation has since worsened, not only because of the condition of the Southside Bridge, but also because the Virginia Street Bridge, another main artery which serves the city, is in need of repair. As the chairman knows, this is my Congressional District.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the gentleman's interest in this particular problem.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman state again, for the record, that it is the committee's intention to give such direction to the Secretary of Transportation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Knowing of the gentleman's history of supporting this much needed artery for the city of Charleston, WV, I can tell the gentleman that it is the direction of the House Public Works Committee, that the Secretary of Transportation give the Southside Bridge high priority for funding under the Discretionary Bridge Program.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the chairman's attention to this and his attention to the needs of West Virginia in this bill.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, when my dear friend and neighbor from Pennsylvania refers to himself as the "skunk at the garden party," I think he is being a little hard on himself. I know many of us have the greatest respect for what he is attempting to do, although we think it is misguided and inaccurate, perhaps. In fact, I have great empathy for the gentleman because he is the only Member of Congress who has stood on this floor to oppose this conference report today.

□ 1550

I think it takes a certain degree of courage and self-confidence to stand so alone, and so I would not characterize him, as he did, as "the skunk at the garden party." He is simply a loner who, no doubt in my mind, is trying to do what he thinks is best.

I confess that I am a bit mystified since I heard the gentleman say that he voted for this bill when it came through the House but he would vote against it today. He talks about demonstration projects and talks about the Secretary's discretionary fund.

Let me inform the gentleman and emphasize to all our colleagues that

the bill before us today contains substantially fewer dollars in demonstration projects, one-half the demonstration project dollars, than were contained in the legislation that the gentleman voted for when the bill came before the House originally. And let me say further that the bill today contains substantially less in discretionary dollars than the bill the gentleman voted for when it came through the House. So I am mystified.

I think it was Churchill who said that consistency is the hobgoblin of little men and little minds. I am not sure that should be applied here. I am certainly mystified, though, at what seems to me to be an inconsistency.

Finally, I would say again and emphasize again that when the gentleman talked about 47 States losing money in this bill compared to the 1982 bill that we passed, that is absolutely true because we have had to reduce the obligatory ceiling in order to comply with the budget. That is the major reason why this funding is cut.

Last and finally, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about his home State of Pennsylvania and not everybody benefitting from demonstration projects. Let me report to the gentleman and to the body that the last demonstration project that this gentleman brought to this floor in the 1982 bill was a demonstration project which attempted to find ways to accelerate the construction of highway projects. Here is the result of that \$25 million demonstration project, a project that took place in Pennsylvania near the gentleman's district. Here is the result: the Federal Highway Administration reports today that as a result of what was learned in that demonstration project, across America there are 137 projects being built using these techniques, and the total expenditure of those projects is \$4.8 billion, for a savings of \$227 million. That one demonstration project is saving more than the entire cost of a single year of demonstration projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means a question about the 12-percent excise tax on heavy trucks and trailers. The tax was scheduled to expire at the end of September next year. I understand that the bill would extend it for another 5 years.

Is it the chairman's understanding that the tax applies where a company simply repairs a vehicle that has been in use for several years?

I know of two cases where this is of interest. One case involves a company in the truck rental business. The company buys a truck brand new from the manufacturer, pays the excise tax, and then rents the truck to a customer for

a period of years. At the end of the lease, the company takes back the truck, cleans up the vehicle by making repairs, and then rents the truck to another customer.

The other case involves a company in the business of repairing highway tractors. Fleet owners and local dealers often bring it tractors for maintenance and repair that have been on the road for as many as 6 or 7 years.

A heavy truck or highway tractor generally lasts about 12 to 15 years, but like any machinery, the mechanical problems and breakdowns increase toward the end of the lifecycle. Generally, when a truck is brought in for maintenance after having been on the road for several years, the person making the repairs tries to replace not only the parts that are worn out, but also parts that can be expected to wear out over the next couple of years. This kind of preventive maintenance ensures that the truck will remain on the road a greater percentage of the time. The alternative would be to replace each part separately each time the truck breaks down.

In both my examples, the repairs are the same. They vary from vehicle to vehicle. Each truck has the engine overhauled or replaced. A truck engine in a large tractor-trailer truck generally lasts only about 3 years under normal use. Otherwise, one truck may be repainted and given new fan belts, batteries, brakes, and a new exhaust system. Another truck may be repainted and given a new bumper, wheels, and floor mats. Another truck may be repainted and given new tires, fender cowl, brakes, drums, U-joints, and a battery. In another case, the truck is given new door locks, water pumps, rocker arms, brakes, muffler, cab mounts, heater cables, and tail lights, while repairs are made on its air-conditioning, rear door, blower, electrical system, shift linkage, steering assembly, and clutch.

The useful life of the truck is not extended by the repairs. The only aim is to ensure that the truck continues to run reliably. My question is whether we intend the tax to be triggered by this kind of normal maintenance.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a general rule, the repair of an automotive vehicle is not subject to the retailers excise tax. There can be situations, however, in which the repair of a vehicle is so extensive that the useful life of the vehicle is extended to the point where the vehicle becomes functionally comparable to a new vehicle. It is the extent and functional result of the restoration that is determinative of whether the tax applies. Such a determination must be

made on the basis of an analysis of the facts and circumstances of each case. As stated in Revenue Ruling 71-584, the assembly of a truck trailer by combining a so-called glider kit with salvaged parts from a used tractor constituted manufacturing. In addition, when the repairs made to one of the taxpayer's vehicles are sufficiently extensive to increase the useful life of the vehicle to approximately the same degree as does the installation of a glider kit, these repairs will also constitute manufacturing.

However, it could well be possible for a taxpayer to make extensive repairs which do not include, for example, replacement of the cab and rail system with new components—such as in a glider kit—without triggering the tax. Substantial repairs may be done to a vehicle under these guidelines without constituting manufacturing as long as it is determined under a facts and circumstances test that such repairs do not extend the useful life of the vehicle to the point where the vehicle becomes functionally comparable to a new vehicle.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that answer.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKEY].

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. I wish to thank the conferees from both bodies whose agreement on this measure has answered the Nation's plea for the expeditious reauthorization of transportation funding.

The public works in our country are deteriorating faster than they are being repaired, replaced, or rehabilitated. The maintenance and improvement of our systems will stimulate the economy and provide thousands of valuable construction-related jobs.

In addition, this bill would have a positive impact on the domestic steel industry.

At my request, David J. Cantor, a specialist in industry economics at the Library of Congress, prepared a memorandum on the possible effect of increased transportation expenditures on steel output.

In his report, Mr. Cantor noted:

Depending on the type of project, the expenditure of \$1 billion could generate a demand for steel mill products in the range from about 54,400 tons to about 150,000 tons. This demand represents both the direct input of steel into the project and associated indirect inputs—namely, those that are embodied in other equipment and materials used in the project. The estimates for each project category are presented in table 1.

TABLE 1.—POSSIBLE EFFECT OF SPENDING \$1 BILLION ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS ON STEEL DEMAND

Project category	[In tons]	
	Low estimate	High estimate
New highways:		
Direct steel inputs.....	23,551	31,401
Indirect steel inputs.....	88,949	118,599
Total steel inputs.....	112,500	150,000
Maintenance and repair of highways:		
Direct steel inputs.....	6,515	8,687
Indirect steel inputs.....	47,896	63,861
Total steel inputs.....	54,411	72,548

Estimated by CRS, using as sources: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, The Detailed Input-Output Structure of the U.S. Economy, 1977, Volume I: The Use and Make of Commodities by Industries, 1977, Washington, 1984; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, The Detailed Input-Output Structure of the U.S. Economy, 1977, Volume II: Total Requirements for Commodities and Industries, 1977, Washington, 1984; and, Data Resources, Incorporated, Realized Steel Prices: Estimation, Analysis, Forecast, Lexington, 1985.

The greatest impact on steel demand would probably be in the category of construction of new highways. An expenditure of \$1 billion on such projects could result in increased use of steel in the range from about 112,500 tons to about 150,000 tons. The smallest effect of this level of spending would probably be in the category of maintenance and repair of highways. For a billion dollars of additional expenditure on such projects, steel input could range from about 54,400 tons to about 72,550 tons.

The direct input of steel into highway projects is relatively small for every billion dollars of expenditure. This steel is used directly in the construction activity, rather than being processed into some other product utilized in the project. Construction of new highways would employ between 23,550 and 31,400 tons of steel mill products directly. Direct steel input is smallest in the maintenance and repair of highways; the low estimate is about 6,500 tons, and the high estimate is about 8,690 tons. Depending on the type of project, the direct steel input to highway is as little as one-eighth of total steel input (maintenance and repair of highways), and nearly as much as one-fifth of total steel input (construction of new highways).

The data seem to suggest that the total amount of steel embodied directly or indirectly in highway construction projects is relatively small. The official input-output tables for the economy indicate, however, that the effect of expenditures on highway projects on total steel demand is greater than for most other sectors of the economy. That is, for every dollar spent on such projects, more steel is required as an input—directly and indirectly—than for most other goods or services. While most of this input is embodied in other goods and services rather than directly in the project itself, the impact on the basic steel industry is substantial vis-a-vis most other sectors of the economy. Out of more than 500 sectors of the economy, only three—engineering, architectural, and surveying services, petroleum refining, and wholesale trade—supply more total inputs directly and indirectly to new highway construction than the basic steel industry. Only four sectors—petroleum refining, motor freight transportation and warehousing, wholesale trade, and paving mixtures and blocks—supply more inputs directly and indirectly to maintenance and repair of highways than the basic steel industry.

Although in relative terms little steel would be required in constructing highways, we cannot dismiss as minimal the impact of such projects on the steel industry. First, such projects are relatively labor intensive. The input-output tables reveal that more than 28 percent of the total expenditure on new highway projects represents payments to labor; depreciation, interest payments, and indirect business taxes account, in addition, for about another 8 percent of spending on these projects. Thus, less than two-thirds of the total project expenditure is for non-labor purchased goods and services required for the projects. In the maintenance and repair of highways and streets, payments to labor account for nearly 57 percent of the total expenditure on these projects, and other non-labor purchased goods and services account for nearly 3.2 percent of total spending on these projects. Second, the steel industry ranks relatively high as a supplier of goods and services to highway construction projects; steel was the twelfth largest direct input to new highway projects in 1977, and the twenty-first largest input to maintenance and repair of highways and streets in that year.

Third, and perhaps most important, even though very little steel is used directly in highway construction projects, the indirect use of steel is considerable. Only three or four other sectors of the economy were called upon more in 1977 for total inputs than the basic steel industry.

In conclusion, I believe the above statements provide ample evidence of the positive impact which this legislation would have upon the steel industry.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join with me today in supporting this measure.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STANGELAND].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANGELAND. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and I want to say first that I rise to express disappointment that my amendment was dropped out of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great disappointment that this conference report does not include an amendment that I passed to the House version last August.

The House went to conference with a provision which would give mass transit systems around this Nation a greater opportunity to contract for some of their services with private sector companies. It has been shown by numerous studies that this would be an opportunity for transit systems to save 20 to 40 percent of their operating costs and reduce their dependence on Federal subsidies.

The only opposition to my amendment came from the transit unions. Once again the unions were able to line their own pockets at the taxpayer's expense.

Mr. Speaker, one day this Congress is going to have to go against the unions and stop insulating public transit workers from the competition of the marketplace. Most of the



people who work and pay taxes in this country do not have the luxury of special provisions which protect their jobs and allow them to have inflated wages.

If you want to know why public bus drivers in the Washington, DC, area make 19 percent more than public school teachers, or if you want to know why bus mechanics at public transit systems make more than twice as much in salary and benefits than unionized mechanics in the private sector, you can find the answer in the so-called labor protection provisions of our transit program.

The House went to conference with language that would correct these problems by bringing competition to public transit. They gave that language away and got nothing in return.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

First, let me commend all of the conferees and players on the House and Senate Public Works Committees for their tireless dedication to this legislation and its predecessors. Special congratulations are in order for our committee chairman, JIM HOWARD; ranking member, JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT; subcommittee chairman, GLENN ANDERSON; ranking member of the subcommittee, BUD SHUSTER; and conferee BOB ROE. Without their leadership and bipartisan teamwork, we never could have crafted such a worthy conference report.

By passing this legislation, we can complete some unfinished business from the 99th Congress. We came excruciatingly close to forging a compromise with the Senate last October, but as everyone—particularly every State highway official—knows, we could not resolve all the issues in order to send the needed legislation to the President.

Today we find the Nation's roads and highways in an increasingly desperate situation. America's highway programs hang in the balance as the shortage of construction money becomes a growing national emergency. With no new funding for fiscal year 1987, States are having to delay or stop thousands of crucial projects.

I am particularly concerned about my own State, Minnesota, and its critical needs. Today, Minnesota is essentially out of funds for its interstate completion, primary, and interstate substitution categories. The interstate 4R and bridge replacement categories have sufficient funding for only part of the year. We are also in danger of losing the construction season. The Minnesota Department of Transportation informs me that if Congress does not act soon, Minnesota's short construction season for 1987 could be lost entirely. Mr. Speaker, by waiting any longer, we put at risk literally thousands of highway drivers' lives and construction workers' jobs.

In response to these concerns, the conferees worked quickly and responsibly over the last few weeks. The resulting legislation before us today will provide a 5-year, \$68 billion extension of the Nation's Highway Program and a 5-year, \$18 billion extension of the Nation's Mass Transit Programs. It also extends highway safety programs and provides uniform standards for the relocation assistance of those displaced by federally assisted construction projects.

The conference report contains sufficient funding to complete the interstate highway system, started some 30 years ago; continues the Interstate 4R, Primary, Secondary, Urban, and Bridge Programs in current law; creates an interstate 4R discretionary account to fund high cost interstate rehabilitation projects; continues the current mass transit formula and discretionary programs; and extends the highway trust fund and highway user fees for 5 years to fund the Highway and Discretionary Mass Transit Programs.

The legislation also authorizes a combined Road Demonstration Program—which resembles a Block Grant Program—for Federal-aid secondary; Federal-aid urban; and off-system, urban, and secondary bridge projects. The program will help demonstrate the feasibility of turning over greater responsibility to State officials for administering the Highway Program. I am particularly pleased the conferees selected Minnesota as one of five States to participate. This reflects well on the Minnesota Department of Transportation, which conducted a similar pilot program last year.

The legislation also includes a number of highway projects to demonstrate the latest techniques for accomplishing various safety and transportation objectives, such as the construction of a half diamond interchange and a grade separation between a railroad line and a highway in Moorhead, MN, and long-range improvement of two segments of a major highway on the Federal-aid primary system in Foston and Bagley, MN.

I am particularly pleased about the Moorhead provision as it culminates 10 years of hard work by dedicated local officials. The \$1.5 million provided in the bill for the underpass will mean increased safety for bus loads of schoolchildren, emergency vehicles, and pedestrians. Because of the Senate's cooperation, particularly that of Senators BURDICK and DURENBERGER, MOORHEAD's long battle for Federal funding has a happy ending.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on H.R. 2. This country can't afford to wait any longer for a highway bill. By voting for today's legislation, we can put Ameri-

ca's Surface Transportation and Relocation Programs back on track.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The Chair wishes to point out that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] has 1 minute remaining and the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding this time to me, and I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal-aid highway reauthorization bill has the potential of extending the America's modern highway system to many more areas of the country and stimulating new economic activity in many places where it is needed the most.

Although there is a great deal about this bill worth talking about, I want to bring to your attention two provisions, in particular, which I believe will greatly benefit every State and virtually every congressional district.

One of the provisions would empower the States to transfer up to 20 percent of their Federal funds for maintaining and rehabilitating interstate highways—the so-called 4R money—over to primary projects. For all practical purposes, these funds are now locked in for interstate work, whether needed or not. Under the provision included in the bill before you today, States would have the flexibility to apply funds to highway projects which are needed the most.

Another provision would allow States to undertake advance construction of primary projects, just as many have done for interstate construction. This would enable the States to move ahead on critical needed road projects by selling bonds, which are paid off as Federal funds start coming in for those projects.

The kind of increased flexibility which this bill offers to your State and mine can accelerate the construction of our noninterstate developmental highway systems, which have been lagging behind for far too long.

Both of these provisions were a part of a bill I introduced last year to extensively restructure the Federal highway aid system—a system which currently emphasizes interstate construction. They were carefully considered by the Public Works and Transportation Committee and have remained in the bill as it comes before the House today.

As more States complete the Interstate Systems, the need for a restructured Federal-aid highway system will become more pronounced. This bill will help us meet that need. It repre-

sents a very important step toward the future.

Chairman HOWARD has done a magnificent job. Without ever losing sight of the country's immediate needs, he has also been concerned about meeting the needs of the future. And this bill reflects that concern. I also want to commend the ranking minority member, JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT; Surface Transportation Subcommittee Chairman GLENN ANDERSON and ranking minority member BUD SHUSTER; other members of the committee who have worked so hard on this bill; and the conferees in both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one more comment. In my view, the administration has been guilty of distorting the facts in its zeal to defeat this measure. Representatives of the Department of Transportation have suggested that demonstration projects are responsible for the reductions in total Federal funding which some States, including Georgia, will experience under this bill.

In fact, there are two other factors which should be cited. First, there is a lower level of funding for highway aid to the States provided by this bill. Second, States like Georgia which have just about completed their Interstate Systems are receiving a smaller share of the interstate funds, and their overall level of assistance is declining.

If you can get anyone in the administration to level with you, they will have to admit that demonstration projects are not really the culprit.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outstanding bill and I join with my colleagues on the committee in urging its passage.

□ 1600

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our real problem with funding that has been brought up is because the trust funds are not off budget. I want to make that point. They are still part of the unified budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a Ways and Means Committee conferee, I signed the conference report and shall vote for H.R. 2 with enthusiasm.

As noted by the previous speaker, Mr. STANGELAND of Minnesota, our State of Minnesota needs this bill and needs it promptly. Northern tier States face a contracting deadline. Any further delay on this bill could result in the loss of an entire construction season for us.

The tax provisions of this bill are not surprising. The trust fund taxes are extended for 5 years. Only one tax

feature, the assessment of 75 percent of the highway use tax on Mexican and Canadian trucks using United States highways is noteworthy. The Congress had been awaiting a study, due in October, by the Department of Transportation on this feature. Without comment on the tax imposed in H.R. 2, I hope the tax committees of both Houses will scrutinize the report and act on it, when presented.

The really big disappointment for me in this bill is the enlargement of "Buy America" provisions. Multiplying the domestic preference by 2½ times and increasing the required domestic content of buses and rolling stock from a prohibitive 50 percent to an impossible 60 percent over 5 years is just one more reason why the United States has trouble gaining market access abroad. As long as we seal up our market from foreign competition, our trading partners will follow our bad example and deny us access to their markets.

Finally, I shall support the limited, State option increase to 65 miles per hour on selected portions of the Interstate System. It is now time to move the law toward what is reality on the highway. It is hard for me to believe the law is saving many lives when I can't find anybody who is obeying it. With respect to energy savings, the 55 miles per hour limit will be a more, more potent weapon in any future energy crunch if it is newly passed at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H.R. 2 and hope for its speedy enactment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not always easy to tell the difference between Johnny Carson and the regular news in the evening. Last night a national newscast had the following items in its report. The second item of the newscast was that the President's commission to study oil supplies for the United States had reported that we are on the eve of another energy crisis becoming too dependent on foreign oil for our use. The recommendation apparently is not that we be conservative with the use of oil but that we give yet another tax loophole to the oil industry.

Two items later, without missing a beat the newscaster reported on the proposition today to abandon the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit and replace it with something like 65 miles per hour, describing the present speed limit as "a relic" from an earlier crisis. Make your own jokes.

I can tell you this: That in my police days, when I was an officer, they said "speed kills," and it does. But I do not think there is any arguing at all whether it uses up more gasoline. You live in a large State, an expansive State? I was in Montana on Monday

driving on the interstate highway about 55 miles an hour and I caught my airplane all right.

I think the real question is: Does the person who lives in the large rural State have any more right as a patriotic American to squander our oil supply than the person who lives anyplace else in the United States?

When I served as a police officer back home in Indianapolis we had an intersection where two streets ended at the same point so that drivers had to take sharp turns. Every month we had about 21 injury accidents at that corner for obvious reasons. People were taking it too wide. I got the county commissioners to pass a resolution and we put up stop signs so when you came up, you stopped and you started around the corner and nobody hit anybody for 2½ years. Then somebody was arrested for running the stop sign and raised all kinds of "ned" about it, and "what sense did it make anyway to have those stop signs there?" So the county commissioners duly repealed the ordinance and down came the stop signs and up went the statistics on the accidents again.

That may have something to do with the debate today.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 2, I rise today in support of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act. As many of my colleagues have said today, this bill is critical to our Nation's transportation needs. If H.R. 2 is not approved and signed by the President on or before April 1, each State must cease awarding highway construction contracts. To the State of California, this means that \$500 million in State and local road projects will be unnecessarily delayed thereby incurring \$50 million in additional costs. Also, over 22,000 full-time jobs statewide are at stake. Moreover, business and sales revenue generated by the State and local construction programs could drop by as much as \$1.1 billion in 1987 and 1988.

The 5-year reauthorization bill funds a number of Federal highway projects. In my home State, H.R. 2 provides for \$1.6 billion in Federal funds to complete California's remaining interstate highway; and, in my district, H.R. 2 funds five projects, including a \$10.8 million project to construct a four-lane expressway on Route 99/77 in Sacramento County. In the city of Vacaville, H.R. 2 provides for a \$2.3 million project which would widen the Alamo Drive overcrossing on Interstate 80 from two lanes to four lanes. In addition, the bill includes two projects in Fairfield totaling \$0.74 million. Reconstruction of Holiday Lane from Oliver Lane to Travis Boulevard is planned as well as reconstructing East Tabur Avenue from North Texas to Dover.

H.R. 2 authorizes \$68 billion nationwide for highways and \$21 billion for mass transit over 5 years. California is slated to receive \$5.5 billion over the same period of time. On behalf of the businesses and constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of California, I urge this body to pass H.R. 2.



Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. I want to also commend the conferees, especially Chairman HOWARD, Subcommittee Chairman ANDERSON, and ranking minority members HAMMER-SCHMIDT and SHUSTER for their hard work on this measure. Their leadership on this legislation was critical for the rapid passage of this bill and the rebuilding and strengthening of our road and transit systems.

The report authorizes \$67 billion for highway construction and repair, \$2 billion for highway safety, and \$17.7 billion for our mass transit systems. Because of the failure of the last Congress to pass this bill, many of the surface transportation programs have been left without funding since September 1986. It is thus essential that this reauthorization be adopted immediately and overwhelmingly, leaving no doubt that this measure should quickly become law.

Included in this legislation are funds for bus and bus facility procurements which are so essential for improving the mobility of our urban and nonurban citizens alike. The new buses, maintenance facilities, bus shelters, and related improvements which this bill calls for would greatly increase the efficiency and convenience provided by our mass transit systems. Any further delays in the reauthorization before us would be tragic for transit systems all over the Nation.

However, the largest portion of H.R. 2 is for highway repairs, construction, and safety. These programs are those most severely affected by the disruption in construction schedules caused by the inability of the last Congress to enact this measure.

In my home State of Massachusetts, for example, a number of projects slated for advertisement have already been placed on hold by the department of public works due to the current lack of funding. Others will be pushed back further if delays in the authorization continue.

In my own congressional district, projects including safety improvements to East Street in Pittsfield, resurfacing I-91 in Whately, Deerfield, and Greenfield, and reconstruction of Route 2 in Williamstown were scheduled to be advertised during the first 6 months of the fiscal year. At current funding levels, and without this reauthorization, these projects simply can't move forward.

Two months have gone by now since the House passed H.R. 2 by a vote of 401 to 20. In these 2 months the construction season has begun again in many parts of the country. However, without these authorizations, the projects which are so crucial to building our Nation's transportation network will be held in limbo.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to appreciate both the urgency of this legislation and the gains which have been made thus far to promote its passage. Let's not bring our Nation's surface transportation to a halt. Vote for rapid passage of this measure and let's get this important business done.

Again, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the conference report

on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act. As a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, I know how vital the passage of this legislation is to our Nation in funding highway and public transit projects.

Philadelphia has a number of critical highway projects that are being held up by a lack of funding. Passage of this conference agreement will help get these projects moving again. I am especially concerned that this legislation be approved quickly so that these vital projects are not delayed any further. Philadelphia road projects will receive over \$178 million in Federal highway funds as a result of approval of this highway and transit agreement.

These projects include major reconstruction of sections of Interstate 95 to begin in 1989, \$2 million for new signalization on Cottman Avenue, reconstruction and widening of the Woodhaven Road interchange at I-95, and completion of the Vine Street Expressway interchange at I-95.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also will generate jobs for Philadelphia. These construction projects will employ hundreds of men and women in the Delaware Valley. It will be a real boost to our economy.

This conference agreement also authorizes funding for mass transit programs for SEPTA. Federal funding accounts for about 6 percent of SEPTA's \$554 million operating budget and an estimated 75 percent of SEPTA's capital improvements budget, which is about \$100 million annually.

As a Representative from Philadelphia, I am especially pleased that passage of the conference report will give a green light to some critical projects in our city. It has been my privilege to have helped to develop this legislation in committee, and I urge the House to give the agreement an overwhelming vote.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the \$86 billion Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act, a bill which will allow for necessary highway and transit projects to continue. For months now, I have heard from State officials, construction contractors, transit officials, and concerned constituents of the immediate need for the highway legislation. I am sure that many of my colleagues have received similar requests to move swiftly on this important legislation. Today is the day to restore the funds and show that we care about the safety of everyone traveling on the highway and transit systems of this country. I urge all Members to vote for this desperately needed bill.

The legislation authorizes the Federal Highway Administration [FHA] to provide financial assistance to the States for the construction and improvement of roads, bridges, and highways. All funds received by the States are financed from the highway trust fund. The fund established by Congress in 1956 is supported by revenues from the 9 cent gasoline tax. However, no funds can be spent without annual authorizations. The importance of the program is shown by the fact that the State governments rely on Federal assistance for more than a quarter of their annual highway budgets.

In Massachusetts, FWA programs fund the design and construction of interstate projects such as the proposed depression of the Cen-

tral Artery and the construction of a Third Harbor Tunnel. Massachusetts has also benefited from funds for the resurfacing, restoration, and reconstruction of existing interstates such as the Southeast Expressway. These projects are essential to the Boston metropolitan area which has one of the most traffic dense populations in the United States. Current projects already underway are being seriously hampered and in some cases, stopped altogether, pending the passage of this legislation.

Transit systems, such as the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority, are equally dependent on the continuation of Federal assistance under this legislation for their overall budget. During fiscal year 1986 approximately \$56.7 million in Federal mass transit authority moneys were used for systemwide improvements to the MBTA, including the rehabilitation and construction of bridges on commuter rail lines and platform revitalizing projects. These projects include improvements along the Orange line which runs virtually through my district. Currently, the MBTA has pending applications for over \$100 million in fiscal year 1987 funds, which include proposals for the purchase of new commuter rail vehicles and track improvements. Public safety is at risk without the needed repairs funded by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of our surface transportation system have been addressed in many ways throughout the years. Some Members may want to heed the advice of Will Rogers: "The only way to solve the traffic problems of the country is to pass a law that only paid-for cars are allowed to use the highways. That would make traffic so scarce we could use our boulevards for children's playgrounds." On the other hand, I consider the legislation before us as a comprehensive, well-designed approach to confronting our surface transportation needs.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us—H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act—is crucial to my State of California, and of particular importance to Contra Costa County, which I represent.

Every poll in the Bay Area of California indicates that the issue of growth—and the related problem of traffic congestion—is the No. 1 topic. My own East Bay region is particularly vulnerable to major traffic tieups and accidents.

I am grateful that both the House and Senate committees have agreed to adopt my proposal to fund the widening and lowering of Highway 4 at the Willow Pass grade near West Pittsburg, in Contra Costa.

This stretch of freeway has been a major headache for commuters from the eastern portion of my county. The House and Senate decision will serve a dual purpose: The Highway 4 improvements will ease the current congestion, while simultaneously ending a major obstacle to extending rapid rail transportation into East County.

This legislation also authorizes improvements and extensions in mass transit systems such as BART—a major need in the San Francisco Bay Area of California.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been delayed and stymied for more than a year. Yet all of us recognize its importance and the urgency of

enacting this legislation. In Contra Costa County alone, this bill is crucial to the completion of the Interstate 680—Highway 24 interchange in Walnut Creek—one of the most congested major intersections in northern California. It is vital to the Knox-Hoffman Freeway, linking Richmond to San Rafael. And it means real progress on the long-awaited Highway 4 improvements.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, which reauthorizes our Nation's highway and mass transit programs for the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, timely action by the Congress and the President on this bill is essential. Due to the delay in reauthorizing this legislation, our States have run out of funds to maintain and improve our highway and mass transit resources. Failure to pass this important legislation will only further threaten the loss of the 1987 construction season threatening thousands of jobs in the construction industry.

I strongly believe that the Federal Government must provide stable and adequate funding so that the States will be able to provide for their future transportation needs. The highway trust fund, which is funded with revenues from the Federal gas tax, has adequate funds to finance the more than \$86 billion for our highway and mass transit programs over the next 5 years.

The maintenance and improvement of our transportation infrastructure is vital to our Nation's economic well-being. With 20 percent of our gross national product generated through transportation, we cannot afford to delay this program any further. I urge my colleagues to put aside their differences so that this money can be delivered to the States for the approaching construction season.

This bill is good for New Jersey and the Nation. It will bring over \$313 million in Federal highways and \$186 million in mass transit money to New Jersey this year. At a time when New Jersey is working to complete a number of important highway projects, this bill provides funds that are an essential element of the State transportation trust fund. In the 11th Congressional District, for example, interstates such as Routes 24, 287, 280, and 80 need the Federal dollars that this reauthorization ensures.

H.R. 2 also provides almost \$1 billion in mass transit capital and operating assistance to New Jersey over the next 5 years. As our highways reach their capacity, mass transit becomes more and more important. In New Jersey, mass transit users will be the prime beneficiary of these funds as New Jersey Transit strives to meet the needs of the New Jersey commuter.

The bill authorizes \$68.6 billion over the next 5 years from the trust fund for the completion and maintenance of our Nation's highway program. It also authorizes \$17.8 billion for mass transit capital and operating assistance over the same period.

By passing this bill we will minimize program disruption, project delays, and job dislocation. Delays cost money. The States are waiting for us to provide them with the money to keep their programs going. The rapid reauthorization of this legislation is essential to the stabil-

ity of these critical highway and mass transit projects.

As a member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee that developed this legislation mandating the 5 year extension of our highway and mass transit programs, I strongly support the conference committee agreement. This important bill addresses the increasing transportation needs of the country. It ensures that progress made on our Nation's transportation systems will continue long into the future.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1987, and wish to commend the leadership of the Public Works and Transportation Committee for bringing back from conference such well-crafted compromise legislation. Chairmen JIM HOWARD and GLENN ANDERSON and my ranking colleagues JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT and BUD SHUSTER deserve our thanks for their diligent efforts in forging a bill that will improve America's interstate transportation system as well as her local mass transit service.

I am particularly pleased by the conferees' reasoned approach to the Buy America provision of the bill. Though I support Buy America, I alerted the committee to the basic unfairness of raising the current 50 percent requirement to 85 percent overnight. Many foreign companies that invested millions of dollars in the United States and created thousands of American jobs came here after State and local governments offered incentives to bring them to our shores. These companies invested here in good faith and relied on the stability of the 50 percent Buy America provision now in existence.

Thus, I congratulate the conferees for mandating an increase in the Buy America formula without endangering existing rolling stock manufacturers. My constituents appreciate your efforts and owe their jobs to your careful work in the conference.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear my continued interest in a balanced, professionally crafted study by the Transportation Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences pursuant to section 158 of the conference report. It is important that the TRB study focus on the range of regulatory alternatives to existing Federal bridge formula and weight limits as they apply to specialized hauling vehicles. Specialized hauling vehicles, which play an integral role in intrastate and interstate commerce, are wheeled vehicles that carry bulk materials—gravel, cement, trash, scrap, et cetera. These vehicles:

Have heavy tare weights attributable to specialized equipment and/or structural design;

Are designed to maximize maneuverability when operated on-road and off-road, on urban streets and in narrow alleys, and at construction sites and other similar operating situations in which configurations of longer vehicles with additional axles is not feasible because of the need for maneuverability; and,

Are not capable of compliance with the Federal bridge formula when fully loaded to rated capacity.

While bridge and road safety and pavement preservation are paramount in my mind, it is

critical to the objectivity of the study that it include all of the following:

An analysis of alternative methods of determining a gross vehicle weight limit and axle loadings for all types of motor carrier vehicles operating on the Interstate System;

An analysis of the effects of enforcement on the Interstate System of the bridge formula contained in section 127 of title 23, United States Code, in view of current vehicle configurations—giving particular attention to specialized hauling vehicles—pavement and bridge stress in accord with 1987 design and construction practices, and existing bridges on the Interstate System;

Recommended treatment for specialized hauling vehicles that do not comply with the Federal bridge formula; and,

Identification of optimal axle loading and spacing requirements taking into account all costs and benefits to business, government, and the general public.

I appreciate the conferees hard work, and am pleased that the 1987 highway construction and repair season will be able to proceed with minimum disruption. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, as well as the administration, to support this bill so that we may move on to some other very pressing issues on the national agenda.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation Act. I pledge to continue my strong support for the maintenance and growth of our great highway system, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report so that we may resume distribution of these important Federal funds to State highway administrations as soon as possible.

It is imperative that we renew Federal funding to highway building programs quickly in order to avoid further delays and increased construction costs. We have succeeded in creating one of the greatest transportation networks in the world through our Federal Highway Program, and I am proud to raise my voice in support of this fine system. I urge my colleagues to expedite passage of this crucial legislation.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke during the debate on H.R. 2 on January 21, I urged prompt action and commended Public Works Committee chairman and vice chairman, JAMES HOWARD and JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, as well as the Surface Transportation Subcommittee chairman and vice chairman respectively, GLENN ANDERSON and BUD SHUSTER for moving the bill to the front of our agenda. I also called upon our colleagues in the other body to not only take quick action but to adopt a comprehensive bill. I promised to make every effort to protect demonstration projects in conference and I am grateful for the cooperation of the conferees.

I admit I had a special interest in the proposed Basin Street underpass in Allentown, PA, because my predecessor and I had been continually frustrated in our legislative efforts to eliminate the problems at three Conrail rail crossings. Basin Street was a major bottleneck point in the city for over 20 years and the traffic problems had become severe. I am



naturally delighted the \$6 million Basin Street project is in the conference report but am also pleased many other demonstration projects were included. I have always emphasized that another route to help correct U.S. infrastructure including road and bridge problems is by way of the demonstration projects. Construction made possible by these projects will result in significantly improved safety, economic, and environmental impact.

The conference report provides for \$600,000 a year over the 5-year authorization amounting to \$3 million or 50 percent. An additional 30 of the 80 percent Federal funding is provided from the Secretary's discretionary fund totaling \$1.8 million. The balance of \$1.2 million, or 20 percent, will be provided by the State according to the agreed on formula. PennDOT has included Basin Street in their 12 year plan and I can point with pride to our Allentown and Lehigh County effort of budgeting 10 percent or \$600,000 for fiscal year 1987.

I know it takes time to complete surveys, design, and environmental studies but it looks like we really made it this time. Mr. Speaker, in the not too distant future, those from the Lehigh Valley and motorists coming to our area will no longer be singing the "Basin Street Blues."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves to recommit the Conference Report on the bill, H.R. 2, to the committee on conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point or order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the adoption of the conference report.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 25, nays 401, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

#### YEAS—25

Army	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Badham	Hyde	Shumway
Brown (CO)	Inhofe	Smith, Denny
Cheney	Kyl	(OR)
Coble	Lagomarsino	Smith, Robert
Crane	Lukens, Donald	(NH)
Dreier	Lungren	Solomon
Gregg	Mack	Stump
Herger	McMillan (NC)	Walker

#### NAYS—401

Ackerman	Daub	Hastert
Akaka	Davis (IL)	Hatcher
Alexander	Davis (MI)	Hawkins
Anderson	de la Garza	Hayes (IL)
Andrews	DeFazio	Hayes (LA)
Annuizio	DeLay	Hefley
Anthony	Dellums	Hefner
Applegate	Derrick	Henry
Archer	DeWine	Hertel
Aspin	Dickinson	Hill
Atkins	Dicks	Hochbrueckner
AuCoin	Dingell	Holloway
Baker	DioGuardi	Hopkins
Ballenger	Dixon	Horton
Barnard	Donnelly	Houghton
Bartlett	Dorgan (ND)	Howard
Barton	Dornan (CA)	Hoyer
Bateman	Dowdy	Hubbard
Bates	Downey	Huckaby
Bellenson	Duncan	Hughes
Bennett	Durbin	Hutto
Bentley	Dwyer	Ireland
Bereuter	Dymally	Jacobs
Berman	Dyson	Jeffords
Bevill	Early	Jenkins
Biaggi	Eckart	Johnson (CT)
Bilbray	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Bilirakis	Edwards (OK)	Jones (NC)
Bliley	Emerson	Jones (TN)
Boehlert	English	Jontz
Boggs	Erdreich	Kanjorski
Boland	Espy	Kaptur
Boner (TN)	Evans	Kasich
Bonior (MI)	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Bonker	Fawell	Kennedy
Borski	Fazio	Kennelly
Bosco	Feighan	Kildee
Boucher	Fields	Kleczka
Boulter	Fish	Kolbe
Boxer	Flake	Kolter
Brennan	Flippo	Konnyu
Brooks	Florio	Kostmayer
Broomfield	Foglietta	LaFalce
Brown (CA)	Foley	Lancaster
Bruce	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Bryant	Ford (TN)	Latta
Buechner	Frank	Leach (IA)
Bunning	Prenzel	Leath (TX)
Burton	Frost	Lehman (CA)
Bustamante	Galleghy	Lehman (FL)
Byron	Gallo	Leland
Callahan	Garcia	Lent
Campbell	Gaydos	Levin (MI)
Cardin	Gejdenson	Levine (CA)
Carper	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Carr	Gephardt	Lewis (FL)
Chandler	Gibbons	Lewis (GA)
Chapman	Gilman	Lightfoot
Chappell	Gingrich	Lipinski
Clarke	Glickman	Livingston
Clay	Gonzalez	Lloyd
Clinger	Goodling	Lott
Coats	Gordon	Lowry (WA)
Coelho	Gradison	Lujan
Coleman (MO)	Grandy	Luken, Thomas
Coleman (TX)	Grant	MacKay
Combest	Gray (IL)	Madigan
Conte	Gray (PA)	Manton
Conyers	Green	Markey
Cooper	Guarini	Marlenee
Coughlin	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Courter	Hall (OH)	Martin (NY)
Coyne	Hall (TX)	Martinez
Craig	Hamilton	Matsui
Crockett	Hammerschmidt	Mavroules
Dannemeyer	Hansen	Mazzoli
Darden	Harris	McCandless

McCloskey	Porter	Smith, Robert
McCollum	Price (IL)	(OR)
McCurdy	Price (NC)	Snowe
McDade	Purseil	Solarz
McEwen	Quillen	Spence
McGrath	Rahall	Spratt
McHugh	Rangel	St Germain
McKinney	Ravenel	Staggers
McMillen (MD)	Ray	Stallings
Meyers	Regula	Stangeland
Mfume	Rhodes	Stenholm
Mica	Richardson	Stokes
Michel	Ridge	Stratton
Miller (CA)	Rinaldo	Studds
Miller (OH)	Ritter	Sundquist
Miller (WA)	Roberts	Sweeney
Mineta	Robinson	Swift
Moakley	Rodino	Swindall
Mollinari	Roe	Synar
Mollohan	Roemer	Tallan
Montgomery	Rogers	Tauke
Moody	Rose	Taylor
Moorhead	Rostenkowski	Thomas (CA)
Morella	Roth	Thomas (GA)
Morrison (CT)	Roukema	Torres
Morrison (WA)	Rowland (CT)	Torricelli
Mrazek	Rowland (GA)	Towns
Murphy	Roybal	Trafficant
Murtha	Russo	Udall
Myers	Sabo	Upton
Nagle	Saiki	Valentine
Natcher	Savage	Vander Jagt
Neal	Sawyer	Vento
Nelson	Saxton	Visclosky
Nichols	Schaefer	Volkmer
Nielson	Scheuer	Vucanovich
Nowak	Schneider	Walgren
Oakar	Schroeder	Watkins
Oberstar	Schuetz	Waxman
Obey	Schulze	Weber
Olin	Schumer	Weiss
Ortiz	Sharp	Weldon
Owens (NY)	Shaw	Wheat
Owens (UT)	Shuster	Whittaker
Oxley	Sikorski	Whitten
Packard	Sisisky	Williams
Panetta	Skaggs	Wilson
Parriss	Skeen	Wise
Pashayan	Skelton	Wolf
Patterson	Slattery	Wolpe
Pease	Slaughter (NY)	Wortley
Penny	Slaughter (VA)	Wyden
Pepper	Smith (FL)	Wylie
Perkins	Smith (IA)	Yates
Petri	Smith (NE)	Yatron
Pickett	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Pickle	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—7

Collins	Lowery (CA)	Traxler
Daniel	Stark	
Kemp	Tauzin	

□ 1620

Messrs. EDWARDS of California, KONNYU, BURTON of Indiana, and KLECKZA, Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. SAVAGE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DREIER of California, KYL, INHOFE, COBLE, ROBERT F. SMITH, and GREGG changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Chair wishes to remind Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 17, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

**YEAS—407**

Ackerman	Dellums	Houghton
Akaka	Derrick	Howard
Alexander	DeWine	Hoyer
Anderson	Dickinson	Hubbard
Andrews	Dicks	Huckaby
Annunzio	Dingell	Hughes
Anthony	DiGuardi	Hunter
Applegate	Dixon	Hutto
Archer	Donnelly	Hyde
Army	Dorgan (ND)	Inhofe
Aspin	Dornan (CA)	Ireland
Atkins	Dowdy	Jacobs
AuCoin	Downey	Jeffords
Badham	Duncan	Jenkins
Baker	Durbin	Johnson (CT)
Ballenger	Dwyer	Johnson (SD)
Barnard	Dymally	Jones (NC)
Bartlett	Dyson	Jones (TN)
Barton	Early	Jontz
Bateman	Eckart	Kanjorski
Bates	Edwards (CA)	Kaptur
Bennett	Edwards (OK)	Kasich
Bentley	Emerson	Kastenmeier
Bereuter	English	Kennedy
Berman	Erdreich	Kennelly
Bevill	Espy	Kildee
Biaggi	Evans	Klecza
Bilbray	Fascell	Kolbe
Bilirakis	Fawell	Kolter
Billey	Fazio	Konnyu
Boehert	Feighan	Kostmayer
Boggs	Fields	Kyl
Boland	Fish	LaFalce
Boner (TN)	Flake	Lancaster
Bonior (MI)	Flippo	Lantos
Bonker	Florio	Latta
Borski	Foglietta	Leach (IA)
Bosco	Foley	Leath (TX)
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Lehman (CA)
Boulter	Ford (TN)	Lehman (FL)
Boxer	Frank	Leland
Brennan	Frenzel	Lent
Brooks	Frost	Levin (MI)
Broomfield	Galleghy	Levine (CA)
Brown (CA)	Gallo	Lewis (CA)
Bruce	Garcia	Lewis (FL)
Bryant	Gaydos	Lewis (GA)
Bunning	Gejdenson	Lightfoot
Burton	Gekas	Lipinski
Bustamante	Gephardt	Livingston
Byron	Gibbons	Lloyd
Callahan	Gilman	Lott
Campbell	Gingrich	Lowry (WA)
Cardin	Glickman	Lujan
Carper	Gonzalez	Luken, Thomas
Carr	Goodling	Lukens, Donald
Chandler	Gordon	MacKay
Chapman	Gradison	Madigan
Chappell	Grandy	Manton
Cheney	Grant	Markey
Clarke	Gray (IL)	Marlenee
Clay	Gray (PA)	Martin (IL)
Clinger	Green	Martin (NY)
Coats	Guarini	Martinez
Coble	Gunderson	Matsui
Coelho	Hall (OH)	Mavroules
Coleman (MO)	Hall (TX)	Mazzoli
Coleman (TX)	Hamilton	McCandless
Combest	Hammerschmidt	McCloskey
Conte	Hansen	McCollum
Conyers	Harris	McCurdy
Cooper	Hastert	McDade
Coughlin	Hatcher	McEwen
Courter	Hawkins	McGrath
Coyne	Hayes (IL)	McHugh
Craig	Hayes (LA)	McKinney
Crockett	Hefley	McMillan (NC)
Dannemeyer	Hefner	McMillen (MD)
Darden	Henry	Meyers
Daub	Hertel	Mfume
Davis (IL)	Hiler	Mica
Davis (MI)	Hochbrueckner	Michel
de la Garza	Holloway	Miller (CA)
DeFazio	Hopkins	Miller (OH)
DeLay	Horton	Miller (WA)

Mineta	Rhodes
Moakley	Richardson
Molinar	Ridge
Mollohan	Rinaldo
Montgomery	Ritter
Moody	Roberts
Moorhead	Robinson
Morella	Rodino
Morrison (CT)	Roe
Morrison (WA)	Roemer
Mrazek	Rogers
Murphy	Rose
Murtha	Rostenkowski
Myers	Roth
Nagle	Roukema
Natcher	Rowland (CT)
Neal	Rowland (GA)
Nelson	Roybal
Nichols	Russo
Nielson	Sabo
Nowak	Salki
Oaker	Savage
Oberstar	Sawyer
Obey	Saxton
Olin	Schaefer
Ortiz	Scheuer
Owens (NY)	Schneider
Owens (UT)	Schroeder
Oxley	Schuette
Packard	Schulze
Panetta	Schumer
Parris	Sharp
Pashayan	Shaw
Patterson	Shuster
Pease	Sikorski
Penny	Siskisky
Pepper	Skaggs
Perkins	Skeen
Petri	Skelton
Pickett	Slattery
Pickle	Slaughter (NY)
Porter	Slaughter (VA)
Price (IL)	Smith (FL)
Price (NC)	Smith (IA)
Pursell	Smith (NE)
Quillen	Smith (NJ)
Rahall	Smith (TX)
Rangel	Smith, Robert
Ravenel	(OR)
Ray	Snowe
Regula	Solarz

**NAYS—17**

Brown (CO)
Buechner
Crane
Dreier
Gregg
Herger
Lagomarsino

**NOT VOTING—9**

Beilenson
Collins
Daniel

Kemp
Lowery (CA)
Stark

Solomon
Stump
Walker
Williams

□ 1630

Mr. DORNAN of California changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1640

**MAKING A CORRECTION RELATING TO THE MAXIMUM SPEED LIMIT, IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2**

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 124, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) to make a correction relating to the maximum speed limit, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 2, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 77

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2) to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:*

(1) At the end of title I add the following new section:

**SEC. 174. FIFTY-FIVE MILES PER HOUR SPEED LIMIT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection 154(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "other than a highway on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more, (2) a maximum speed limit on any highway within its jurisdiction on the Interstate System located outside of an urbanized area of fifty thousand population or more in excess of sixty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour"; and

(2) by renumbering "(2)" as "(3)" at the two places "(2)" appears.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection 154(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting "on public highways with speed limits posted at fifty-five miles per hour" immediately after "hour".

(2) In the table of contents contained in section 1(b) of the bill, add at the end of the portion relating to title I the following:

"Sec. 174. Fifty-five miles per hour speed limit."

Mr. GRAY of Illinois (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. KILDEE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 124, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Is the gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] opposed?

Mr. HOWARD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. **HAMMERSCHMIDT**. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. **HAMMERSCHMIDT**. Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is this: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, there is 1 hour of time under the rule, and it will be divided 30 minutes to the gentleman who offered the resolution, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and 30 minutes to the proponent of the 55-



mile-an-hour position, Mr. HOWARD, the chairman of the committee.

Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, 13 years ago, in 1974, our distinguished chairman and our dear friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] offered a bill that was adopted into law limiting the speed limit across this Nation to 55 miles an hour.

I want to compliment him, it was badly needed at that time, because we had an energy crisis; but like so many other things in this country things change, times change; it is an antiquated law and it should be changed.

The resolution before us is very simple. It is an up-or-down vote on whether or not we allow the States to be permissive, not mandatory—I want to reemphasize, be permissive in changing the speed limit upward to 65 on rural interstates only.

In the next hour, I think you will learn that the American Automobile Association is for changing it, they have millions of members; the Governors Association is for changing it; the President of the United States is for changing it; the Department of Transportation is for changing the speed limit; and 68 percent of the American people on all polls have indicated that they are not adhering to the 55, and on rural interstates they feel that it should be changed to 65.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this time.

I, too, would like to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Public Works and Transportation for not only his great effort in bringing about very needed legislation in 1974, but also in bringing something or allowing something to come to the House that I know he feels so strongly about.

We have crafted an excellent highway bill, and this has been a bipartisan effort, and it has been the bipartisanism with which is in the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, is certainly due to the engineering of the chairman of the full committee.

This is a law whose time has come to change. Change sometimes is very difficult; however, it is very necessary. In this instance, and before each of you, my colleagues, files your vote at the

end of the hour of debate that we have set aside, ask yourself but one question: If you exceed the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit, do not vote to keep it? If you have exceeded the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit, then vote to allow the States to work their will on this legislation and increase the speed limit to 65 in those areas where it is safe.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, America is many varied, different places, with differing needs, various demands, changing requirements, and through the years as Congress has adopted legislation we tried to adapt it to the various needs and demands of this country.

America is a place of many kinds of geography. America is a place of many, many different kinds of highways. Rural America does not have a beltway; you cannot stand on the highway out in Montana and watch the beltway curve; but you can do this: You can stand on the highway, and I swear to you, you can see the Earth curve out at the end of that highway, 60 miles of straight stretch, and sometimes you traverse that entire 60 miles and you only pass two cars.

My friends, on the way to talk to 20 people in Montana, I run over 15 jack-rabbits. Do we have a high death rate on some of these rural highways? Yes, we do, but it is not related to traffic; it is not related to speed; it is related to things like the winter and terrible icy conditions.

Respect the differences in this country. Respect the different transportation needs by supporting this piece of legislation.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today Members of the House will have an opportunity to return to the States a right guaranteed them under the Constitution. I am referring to today's vote to allow States to set the maximum speed limit on rural highways within their borders.

The current, federally mandated speed limit is a classic example of violation of the 10th amendment, which was designed by the Founding Fathers to grant States all powers and rights not expressly reserved for the Federal Government. In my view, it is ludicrous to suggest—as Congress has done by reserving this power unto itself—that States are not as capable as the Federal Government of evaluating local traffic, road conditions, and statistical information. States are as responsive to constituents as Congress, and I believe even more qualified to resolve their highway problems, simply because they're closer to them.

I am not arguing for or against a higher speed limit per se. Rather, I am speaking in strong support of allowing States to weigh suggestions that "55 saves lives," as stated on a popular bumper sticker, against data from the Federal Highway Administration indicating that highway fatalities have decreased in spite of an increase in driving speeds. Protecting life through sound traffic laws is a goal shared nationwide, but cannot be accomplished through imposing an inflexible national standard which is unresponsive to local traffic conditions. Rather, the way to assure the safety of our Nation's highways is to permit State and local officials to evaluate the traffic conditions and set speed limits accordingly.

Let's return to the States a right which has traditionally and constitutionally been theirs: the right to set highway speed limits.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1974 we passed this mandatory law which changed the speed limit. Now it is 1987. This thing was a good law at the time; it was probably the right thing to do, and I commend those who passed it.

However, Mr. Speaker, it has outlived its time; it is now time for the people to change it. I remember distinctly the Governor of Utah, many years ago when I was in the legislature making the statement, and he was quoting Abraham Lincoln, and he said: "Don't pass laws people won't obey."

I think we have a classic one that people will not obey. In this next hour, we will hear many statistics about what is right and what is wrong, and let me just say frankly, it is like being in a lawsuit: You listen to the plaintiff's attorney, the plaintiff's doctor, and he says one thing; you believe another. We will hear those statistics.

The cold facts are, we have a law that people across America do not feel is one they can live with. In my own State, we are sometimes criticized for having the second highest rate of fatalities out in the remote areas. Let me say, we do not have an emergency hospital. They are going to be in the ambulance for 2 or 3 hours before they have the opportunity of getting to a hospital.

Those of us who live in the West do not see why we have to have those in the East have the same kind of doctrine that we are controlled by. The Hansen-McCurdy amendment that we put in earlier, and came within 20 votes of passing; it was the type of thing we have now. I do not see the great difference, even though that will be brought up.

It is to the prerogative of the State. In my humble opinion, the State legislative bodies are very qualified to determine whether or not it should be changed.

Last night, if you watched Channel 7, you noticed they were very critical of the change here in Washington. I agree; Washington, New Jersey, and

those areas should keep it at 55, and they should enforce it.

Let me just say this, Mr. Speaker. We get a lot of information like, well, if we move it to 65, we will just drive 70. That does not hold.

Let me just end with this and say; Lincoln also said: The best way to defeat a rule is to strictly enforce it. If we did that, we would be overwhelmed with the public outcry.

□ 1650

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the principles of federalism and urge my colleagues to adopt the great provision to allow the States to raise the speed limit to 65 on rural interstates.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to permit the States, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, to raise the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates. There are several reasons why this makes good sense.

First, notwithstanding the interstate nature of the highway system, traffic laws are uniquely local and reflect differences which clearly exist in driving practices. It is one area of laws that has not been ceded to the Federal Government and for good reason. Each State is uniquely different in terms of highway systems.

It makes sense in my State of Kansas where long stretches of highway and lower volumes of traffic are prevalent to raise the limit to 65 miles per hour on nonmetropolitan interstates. It might not make sense on highways that run through major cities and have a high volume of traffic. Whatever the circumstances, all interstate highways were designed to safely accommodate speeds of 70 miles per hour, and States should have the right to determine where speed limits up to at least 65 miles per hour can be safely allowed.

Second, circumstances have changed since the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit was first adopted in 1974. Studies by the National Research Council have found that there is no statistically significant relationship between average speed and the fatality rate on any given highway. This is also true for other speed measures as well as percentage of drivers exceeding 55 miles per hour or even 65 miles per hour. Also, they found that the average fatality rate among States is lowest on rural interstates yet rural interstates have the highest average speed and have the highest percentage of drivers exceeding the speed limit.

What we are asking for today is not a repeal of the speed limit on all highways, but a modification of the law to recognize the unique nature of rural interstates where the Federal safety standards are high and the traffic count and fatality rates are low. I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 77.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the rank-

ing Republican member on our subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able to take this well today to support a 65-mile-per-hour speed limit. I had hoped to be able to take this well today and support that speed limit because we in the conference had coupled it with a seatbelt law, that we had said that the States could if they so chose go to 65 on rural interstates if they coupled it with a seatbelt law.

Unfortunately, that is not what the conference did. Indeed since last October up through the conference I have been proposing this compromise and I think it is a reasonable compromise. In fact, the National Safety Council and others tell us that if you go to the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit, you will kill about 500 more people on the rural interstates per year. But if you go to the seatbelt law, you will save 1,700 lives per year. So had we been able to accept that compromise of seatbelts with 65, we would be coming here today with a net safety savings of over 1,000 lives per year.

But unfortunately, the conference did not agree to that. So we are faced today not with a safety oriented provision, but rather simply going to 65 and accepting the evidence, the estimates of virtually all of the experts that this will bring about 500 more fatalities per year and more than 5,000 more serious injuries. So I find myself sadly in the position of having to oppose this straight up-or-down vote today.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fiction floating around this floor which goes something like this: That the debate today turns on whether people are going to drive 55 miles an hour in accordance with the law or 65 miles an hour in accordance with the law. Unfortunately, that is not the reality. That is not the issue. The real issue is that historically on the interstates many people drive about 10 miles above the speed limit, the posted speed limit. In fact it even has a special name. It is called the truckers' 10.

The theory is that if you stay within 10 miles above the speed limit, you are not going to get caught due to the imprecision of the equipment that the State police have and due to the State police being willing to go after the high speeders rather than those who stay within that so-called truckers' 10.

So the argument today is not whether people are obeying 55 or whether they will obey 65; the argument is what will they really be driving out there on the interstates? The evidence is overwhelming. Today at a 55-mile-an-hour posted speed limit, they are driving at 65 and they will be driving over 70 and therein lies the rub, therein lies the safety problem.

It is true that the interstate was built to go 70 miles an hour. It is true

many cars are built to go 70 miles an hour. The problem is our bodies are not built to sustain the kind of injuries that one gets at those high speeds, unless we have a seat belt on.

So it is with a certain sadness that I find myself not being able to support what I had hoped would be a reasonable compromise because we have an issue before us which is antisafety, which in no way comes to grips with the very real lifesaving, injury-reducing issue. It is for that reason that I must oppose this proposal which is before us today.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHUSTER. If I have the time, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the comments of the gentleman, but if in fact we are concerned about safety and having people go 55, why do we not then adopt a proposition that 45 be the speed limit?

The concern I have frankly is that you are forcing many of us in this country to be hypocritical. We know we go over 55. Many people, many highways, the average rate of speed is over 55.

Mr. SHUSTER. If I might reclaim my time, if the gentleman wishes to offer that proposal, I am sure the committee will consider it.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at the start of this debate to make clear precisely what this vote is and what it is not. This vote and this issue is not a retreat to the old speed limits, the old 75-mile-per-hour speed limit on the interstates, the old 65-mile-per-hour speed limits on the two-lane highways during the day. This is not a vote on a retreat to the speed limits of yesterday. This is a vote on giving State governments in certain defined areas of this country the option, if they choose, to nudge up the speed limit slightly on interstate highways. That is all this is. Some will say this bill, this amendment, increases the speed limits. It does not.

This gives State governments the opportunity to determine on interstate highways in defined rural areas whether they think it appropriate to increase slightly the speed limit on those interstate highways.

Now, I live in a Midwestern State, sparsely populated. Frankly, I think the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has been good for this country. It has saved energy, it has saved lives and I have generally supported it. But in my judgment, there is a difference, in var-



ious roads around this country; a difference, for example, in getting on the interstate highways to travel from Washington, DC, to Baltimore. It is a 38-mile trip on heavily traveled interstate highways, as opposed to getting on the interchange at Buffalo Gap, ND, and getting to drive to Fargo, ND, a drive of several hundred miles on lightly traveled roads designed for safety at well above 55-mile-per-hour.

It seems to me we must take account of those differences. That is precisely what this amendment does. This amendment is not saying, let us go back to the old days, let us create drag strips on the interstate.

This amendment very moderately says, let us allow State legislators to make decisions on whether on rural interstate highways they would like to increase ever so slightly that speed limit. That is exactly what this issue is, no more, no less, and I hope you will support this amendment, a good amendment.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution offered by my friend from Illinois. As one who has lived his entire life in California, perhaps the single State most closely identified with automobiles and freeways, I recognize that 65 miles per hour on many freeways is a simple fact of life.

But each one of us in this chamber must recognize a second basic truth, that raising the speed limit will increase the number of deaths and crippling injuries resulting from traffic accidents. We recognize this as fact, but the resolution before us does not.

If there is to be a speed increase, and I am not opposed to one, it must, and let me emphasize this, it must be coupled with countervailing safety measures that a State would have to adopt to offset the deaths and injuries resulting from an increase.

The resolution before us simply and flatly fails that. So what I ask of my colleagues is this: Vote "no" on the resolution that is before us. Let us not adopt, in haste, a clearly imperfect Senate proposal, a proposal which fails to include a sanction against States which do not adequately enforce the 65 mph limit on any routes on which the higher limit is implemented.

Give us a chance to go to committee and craft a provision that may provide States with flexibility to increase their speed limit, but not the flexibility to increase by thousands, over the years, the number of people who die on our Nation's highways.

Give our committee the opportunity to succeed in this effort, an effort I should hasten to add which has begun

at this morning's hearing. But even if we do not succeed, our failure will not add to the Nation's highway carnage. Anyone here who fails to oppose this resolution will not be able to say this much.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

□ 1700

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, as the former Lieutenant Governor of the State of California, are you telling us that the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor of the State of California and the State legislature do not have enough ability to make decisions as to what the speed law ought to be on the highways of our home State?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; but I would say that it is up to our responsibility, when we pass a law as dangerous as this one can be, to at least put in those provisions giving them certain guidelines to make sure that they follow them.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why we need to raise the speed limit on rural interstates to 65 miles an hour.

First, hardly anyone is obeying the 55. Our cops should be chasing robbers and drug dealers, not those going 56 miles an hour.

Second, for rural, and Western States, it has been a big burden, losing money and infringing upon people's rights.

Third, circumstances have changed since we enacted the 55. There is no more shortage, and there have been many safety devices on automobiles to lessen the safety hazards.

Mr. Speaker, this provision permits freedom of choice. If you are from New York and want to go 55 on Fifth Avenue, fine. If you are from Chicago and want to go 55 on Michigan Avenue, fine. If you are from Beverly Hills and want to go 55 on Rodeo Drive, fine. Just do not tell those of us from New Mexico and other rural States to go 55 when it should not be.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment permits that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit further information for the RECORD:

#### NEW MEXICO

New Mexico exceeds the current speed limit 50.9% of the time.

New Mexico has over 11,700 miles of highway.

#### SUPPORT

The National Governor's Association has voted overwhelmingly to accept the responsibility for the speed limit.

President Reagan is open to proposals to change the speed limit.

The Senate voted to raise the speed limit.

A major study released by the National Academy of Science—a decade of experience, recommends that States relax the speed limit on noncongested, rural highways. Stating that this "would probably not have a proportional impact of safety."

The study found that compliance has decreased markedly in recent years.

Prior to 1973, speed limits were considered to be something best established and enforced by States, not the Federal Government. We should take this opportunity to get big brother off the backs of the American people.

When the 55-mph speed limit was enacted in 1974 (13 years ago), the primary selling point was energy conservation—this does not hold true today.

#### COSTS

Fuel savings—a motorist might save \$5.00 in gasoline cost on a 550-mile trip by traveling at 55 mph instead of 65 mph, however, the trip would take two hours longer. Therefore, if the motorist's time was valued at more than \$2.50 per hour, he or she would lose by traveling at the lower speed of 55 mph.

Hours—the cost of the national speed limit is estimated to be one billion hours per year.

#### SOME HIGHER LIMITS SHOULD BE TESTED

Until last year, 90 percent of Maryland's motorists drove too fast. When it came to obeying the speed law, they had the USA's poorest record. Suddenly that record improved.

But Maryland's drivers hadn't eased up on the gas pedal. State officials, facing a loss of federal highway money because so many drivers were speeding, just monitored traffic where people weren't as likely to speed. That fixed everything—on paper.

Maryland's not alone. Ninety percent of motorists on some California highways go too fast. More than 50 percent of Arizona's drivers speed. About half the drivers in Montana, Florida, and Vermont break the speed limit law, too.

They're examples of the hypocrisy encouraged by the 55 mph speed limit imposed during the mid-70s fuel crisis. It has become the most flouted law since Prohibition.

The nation's governors and legislators want to set speed limits on their own roads. President Reagan agrees.

That puts more pressure on Congress to back off the 55 mph speed limit. The House is scheduled to vote Wednesday on a proposal to let the states raise the limit on about 80 percent of the 43,000-mile interstate highway system. The Senate already has approved the hike.

Many motorists are already voting with their feet on the accelerators. But you know that if you drive at 55. You know about blinking headlights, tailgaters, and single-digit greetings from scowling motorists as they roar past.

When the Middle East oil embargo cut down oil supplies, U.S. drivers made the sacrifices they were asked to make. They did it reluctantly. But they did it: They drove less, and they slowed down. They saved fuel.

As a bonus, 30,000 lives were also saved.

But now oil is becoming abundant again—and cheaper. Many motorists feel that the 55 mph limit is an unwarranted infringement on their rights.

It would be wrong to let public opinion polls favoring higher speeds stampede us into tearing down the 55 mph speed limit signs.

But those who insist that the speed limit should not be raised under any circumstances ignore the possibility that higher speeds can be tested in some areas.

The federal government should experiment to see if speed limits can be tailored to the diverse needs of motorists and the diverse driving conditions from Wyoming to New Jersey, Florida to North Dakota. Higher limits could be tried out on lightly traveled interstates.

Some drivers in some vehicles on some highways can be safe at speeds higher than 55. But that shouldn't be the green light to turn our highways into raceways.

State and local officials should recognize that tests raising the speed limit will not lower their responsibilities. More traffic enforcement, not less, will be required.

Throughout the tests, safety should prevail. If the higher speeds prove unsafe, revive 55. If they prove safe, raise limits in every area where it's judged not to be dangerous.

Safety, not popularity in the polls, should be the test.

#### GIVE SPEED LIMITS BACK TO THE STATES

**BISMARCK, N.D.**—The straight flat highway between North Dakota's two largest cities, Bismarck and Fargo, is Interstate 94.

It has no mountains, curves, or significant hills, and very sparse traffic.

In my hundreds of trips along I-94, I have never come upon an accident.

I-94 is a highway that traverses the "wide-open spaces" that we North Dakotans are fiercely proud of. A drive on I-94 can be peaceful and, in the subtle way of the Prairie, even scenic. But I-94 is no place to be driving 55 mph.

The North Dakota Legislature realizes this, of course. It has passed a statute that limits the fine for driving up to 70 mph to the rather minor sum of \$15.

But the North Dakota Legislature is not free to set the speed limit. Congress has set 55 mph as the nationwide speed limit. Any state that sets a speed limit over 55 mph loses some of the federal highway funding that states rely on to maintain and update their highway systems.

The real issue is not whether Congress should set the speed limit at 55 mph, 65 mph or even 75 mph. The real issue is whether Congress should be setting the speed limit at all.

Every congressman and senator who believes that the federal government should be mandating nationwide speed limits should be forced to drive the 200 miles of I-94 between Bismarck and Fargo at 55 mph.

The men and women who sit in the North Dakota Legislature do travel our state's highways regularly. They are in a far better position to determine the appropriate speed limit on those roads than are the senators and congressmen in Washington, most of whom have never even set foot in North Dakota.

Unfortunately, sitting in the U.S. Senate or House of Representatives frequently causes one to believe that only Congress is wise enough to make difficult policy decisions.

Only a lawmaker whose vision is clouded by such elitism could believe that the federal government should be setting the speed limit at the same level for an uncrowded interstate in North Dakota, a winding two-lane mountain road in Colorado, and a jammed 12-lane superhighway in Southern California.

Of course, I don't really expect every senator and congressman to drive I-94. That would be silly. But having those senators and congressman determine the speed limit for I-94 is every bit as silly.

**Mr. HOWARD.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], the ranking Republican member of our full committee.

**Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.** Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution. While it may be popular to raise the national speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates, there is every reason to keep the current 55-mile-per-hour limit in place.

Realistically, we are not even talking about 65 miles per hour and 55 miles per hour; we are talking about roughly 62 and above and 72 and above. If many drivers are not observing the present maximum speed limit—and indications are they are not—is there any reason to suppose they will suddenly start observing an even higher limit? Just this morning the media carried interviews of motorists stating they would drive 75 to 80 if the limit is raised to 65.

Notwithstanding the desire or impatience of some to raise the speed limit, the facts clearly show that the 55-mile-per-hour limit saves both lives and fuel. If there is a greater consideration than either of these, I have yet to hear it.

The current speed limit, in combination with safer vehicles, improved highways, and other safety advances, saves an estimated 2,000 to 4,000 lives per year. Since it has been in effect, the 55-mile-per-hour limit has saved a minimum of 26,000 lives. It also prevents some 2,500 to 4,500 fewer serious injuries and 34,000 fewer minor and moderate injuries each year.

Interestingly enough, fatality rates on rural interstate highways are higher than the national average. The National Academy of Sciences estimates that raising the speed limit on these interstates would mean 300 to 400 additional deaths each year. And when we speak of making this exception for rural interstates, we are talking about potentially raising the speed limit on over 70 percent of the Interstate System.

From a cost-benefit perspective, raising the speed limit to 65 miles per hour still does not measure up. Estimates are that the 55-mile-per-hour limit reduces medical bills, legal costs, and costs of motor vehicle damage by \$122 to \$240 million annually.

At today's hearings on the speed limit, an American Trucking Association witness stated that, for his company, their success in reducing accidents is directly related to their commitment to the 55 miles per hour speed limit. In April 1981, they introduced a speed limit policy and those actions were based not on 55 being the

law of the land, but on the reality that 55 would save lives and money. Their safety record has been astounding—a 437-percent decrease in serious accidents, comparing the year 1982 with 1986. And this is a company that travels 50 million highway miles annually.

This company official said that an accident investigation they commissioned after a major 1979 accident, involving a front tire blow-out on one of their tractor trailer combinations concluded, due to the inertial forces associated with increased speed, the controllability of a heavy vehicle is exponentially decreased as speed is increased. Further, the reduction in controllability of the vehicle becomes critical at speeds over 60 miles per hour. This can determine the difference between a major accident or minor incident in the event of a front-end blow-out or sudden evasive action.

So, if the limit is raised, major truck accidents are going to increase and the motoring public is going to be the loser.

The case for retaining the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is as strong as one could possibly be, and I believe that this will be confirmed in the hearings on this issue being held by the Public Works and Transportation Committee today and tomorrow. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to keep it right where it is by rejecting this resolution.

**Mr. GRAY of Illinois.** Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS].

**Mr. STALLINGS.** Mr. Speaker, today, Congress renews its efforts to change the national mandatory 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. This is an issue of vital importance to thousands of Idaho citizens.

I am pleased to join with many of my House colleagues to express support for raising the speed limit. It is important to recognize that our legislative efforts would only give States the option to raise the speed limit on selected roads that can safely handle higher speeds.

A national, uniform speed limit is no longer practical in many rural areas. The law must be changed before it becomes irreparably weakened by public criticism and widespread noncompliance.

Many of us here today have been urged by our constituents to change the speed limit law. I firmly believe that a majority of Idahoans favor a higher speed limit.

The current speed limit is not being obeyed or enforced. Noncompliance on the Interstate Highway System continues to increase. It only breeds disrespect for the law and does not set a very good example for our citizens, particularly our young people.

By not recognizing our country's regional diversity on our highways, the



law forces millions of law-abiding citizens into noncompliance.

The federally mandated speed limit is an unnecessary and unreasonable intrusion into States' rights. Especially in the case of rural States where there are long distances between towns, it is inappropriate for the Federal Government to dictate speed limits.

Too many decisions are made by the Federal Government that could better be made at the State and local level. Highway speed limits should be determined by officials who better understand traffic volumes, road conditions, and other local factors in their own areas.

Setting a higher speed limit on rural interstates would allow a majority of motorists to comply with the law while still driving at safe and reasonable speeds.

It does not make sense to have every highway in the country posted at 55 miles per hour or below. The current law has served its original purpose as an emergency fuel conservation measure during the energy crisis of the seventies.

Adoption of legislation would also make speed limit laws more enforceable. It would allow State enforcement agencies to operate in a more efficient and effective manner by directing more effort and attention on other safety programs, such as the prevention of drunk driving.

Compliance of any speed limit depends on the States for enforcement. Thirty-two percent of State of Idaho law enforcement is being used on the rural interstate where only 22 percent of the fatal accidents occur.

This imbalance of resources is being caused by the necessity to protect Federal funds rather than to direct law enforcement to work in high accident locations on the noninterstate highway sections.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has threatened to withhold Federal highway funds from States, found to have inadequately enforced the speed limit. Thus, many States are forced to choose between saving lives or protecting against the loss of Federal funds.

Furthermore, I do not believe that highway safety would be adversely affected by raising the speed limit. In Idaho where we have 577 miles of rural interstate highway, the trend of fatalities has held constant since 1979, while the speeds have increased for the same period of time.

The assumption that an increase in the speed limit from 55 mph to 65 mph will cause an automatic increase in fatalities is not supported in Idaho by the last 7 years of data.

We should not mandate a 65-mile-per-hour speed limit on all interstate highways. It should be up to each State to determine for themselves

whether they want to raise the speed limit on their highways.

Legislative action to give States the authority and flexibility to determine safe speeds on their highways is long overdue.

Clearly, now is the time to work together to develop a national policy that better reflects the different driving conditions across the country.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG].

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, we cannot pass laws in this body that become the law of the land that the American people will not voluntarily comply with and call that good law.

U.S.A. Today said today that 84.2 percent of the American people said this is not a law that we want to live with because it is not a practical law.

I find it interesting that if we move the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit to 65 miles an hour, that 500 lives will be lost, and yet the same gentleman who used that argument a few minutes ago, my colleague from Pennsylvania, said, "But everybody is already driving 65 miles an hour."

Now that is not logic, Mr. Speaker, that is a smoke screen for the reality of who has the bucks. That is the business we are in here, the bucks. We have the bucks so we have the power. We are telling State Governors and State legislatures and State departments of transportation, you will live by our law because we know better than you.

I do not think our Founding Fathers were wrong when they said, "An all inclusive consuming central Government must be limited and all other powers must reside with the States."

Let us return this optional power to the States today and admit that we are not all-wise, that just because we have the buck, we do not have all of the power. We do have responsibility for safety and security in our States with our legislatures, with our departments of transportation.

Let us be a little logical and understand the problems as they exist today and return to where we were but a few years ago.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say that 84 percent of the American people would ask us to vote in favor of this proposition? Five out of six Americans?

Mr. CRAIG. Five out of six Americans are telling the chairman of this committee and others that they want the law to change.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution by my

colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] and express appreciation for this opportunity to comment briefly on the subject.

The issue has been raised here of so-called States' rights. We are celebrating our bicentennial year, and I think it is prudent for us to go back and reflect on what were considered functions for States, and this one indisputably was, the question of controlling speed limits, until 1974. We departed from that on the false assumption that we are going to be saving exhausting fuel supplies.

The U.S. Geological Survey just a year later came out and said that we had an estimated 185-year supply at those levels of consumption. There is no question in anyone's mind that it is necessary to maintain these as a means of conserving fuel.

Second, that is an individual decision. If you do not like what you pay for gas, cut your own limit back of your own volition. But, finally, on the question of saving lives, the fact of the matter is that as more and more people have become scofflaws, there has been a 25-percent reduction in fatality rates with the escalating speeds.

Mr. Speaker, I submit further information for the Record.

Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution with the clear intent of limiting the powers of the Federal Government. They believed that only by creating a system of checks and balances at the Federal level and likewise reserving extensive powers for the States could freedom and sound government be created and maintained. The U.S. Constitution carefully spells out this division, assigning to each a separate and distinct sphere of action. The 10th amendment provides that the powers not given to the Federal Government be reserved, or set aside, for the States. So long as the States do not violate the Constitution, they may conduct their internal affairs as they see fit; they generally have the power to regulate the health, safety, welfare, and behavior of their citizens. The Federal Government, on the other hand, was given the power to act for the Nation as a whole—among them to tax, to maintain an army, to conduct foreign affairs, maintain a system of justice, and mint a currency.

Mr. Speaker, setting speed limits clearly falls under the right of States to regulate the health, safety, and behavior of their citizens. I thus rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution to allow individual State governments to set their own speed limits on rural highways. It is an important first step in returning to States the full authority to set speed limits on all roads within their territories. Up until 1974, State governments had full authority to set their own speed limits.

But owing to the energy crisis, Congress felt it was in the national interest to usurp these State powers and enforce a national speed limit to save energy. But this usurpation of power, in 1974, was unjustified since the Federal Government did not have to dictate conservation to a free people at a time when pump prices were soaring.

State governments are simply more qualified to set speed limits than the Federal Government. State governments are closer to the people and more aware of local needs. There is every reason to believe that if maintaining the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit is truly a sound and popular idea, then State governments will do the right thing and maintain the status quo. Eastern States which have high population densities and relatively old roads could well retain the current speed limit. But if Western States such as Nevada and Wyoming, which have long stretches of open country roads and a citizenry supportive of higher speed limits, opt to raise the speed limit then so be it. Their elected officials are responsible to their constituents and they understand their own local needs better than bureaucrats in Washington.

In fact, State governments must have the power to set speed limits in order to carry out the wishes of their citizens. A majority of drivers in many Western States exceed the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit because they, obviously, don't agree with it. Roughly 54.6 percent of Arizona drivers and 54.2 percent of Nebraska drivers, for example, drive in excess of 55 miles per hour. The inability of these State governments to change the current law effectively makes average, law-abiding citizens into criminals simply because of their driving habits. As we learned from our experience with prohibition, the rule of law can only be maintained if the laws reflect the will of the people.

Additionally, this Federal attempt to save energy has been of limited value. The 55-miles-per-hour speed limit saves less than 1 percent of the fuel we use in the United States each year. You can improve fuel efficiency by 1 percent just by increasing the pressure in your tires. A 65 miles-per-hour limit would increase fuel consumption by approximately 10 million barrels per year, only reducing the energy savings of the 55 miles per hour limit by 17 percent. With present fossil fuel reserves expected to last well into the future, the issue of whether the 55 miles per hour speed limit conserves energy is moot. If conservation of energy really is a concern, alternative solutions such as reducing automobile weight would prove more pragmatic.

In a recent Wall Street Journal article, Damon Darlin argued that the national speed limit has had a minimal impact on the reduction of highway

fatalities this country has experienced during the last 15 years. By citing statistics from the Department of Transportation, he indicates that factors such as improved medical service, better roads and vehicle characteristics, and even economic factors such as recessions, which reduce the number of cars on the road, have had the greatest impact on saving lives. In fact, as drivers started ignoring the double nickle soon after it was instituted the fatality rate actually dropped by more than 25 percent in the next decade.

According to a recent study conducted by the National Research Council, the 55 miles-per-hour speed limit may even be detrimental to safety on certain roads. This happens not because going faster is somehow safer, but because enforcement of the speed limit misallocates resources away from less-safe roads in favor of the vastly safer interstates. For example, rural interstates, which carry 19 percent of travel on highways posted at 55 miles per hour and which have the highest average speeds, only account for 9 percent of fatalities on roads posted at 55—and a much lower percentage if all roads are considered. By contrast, rural secondary roads carry only 30 percent of travel, yet account for 38 percent of fatalities.

In conclusion, it is high time for this body to pass this concurrent resolution and start the process of returning to States their lawful right to set their own speed limits. The current law needlessly forces the Federal Government to intrude into affairs which should be the sole concern of the States. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing and pass this concurrent resolution today.

□ 1710

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], a member of the committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are a people of contradictions. We cherish life, yet we do not seem to want anyone telling us how to preserve it.

I am willing to let the other guy who wants to drive 65 or 85 kill himself, if that is the choice that person wants to make, but I do not want that car crossing over the median strip and going into my car or into someone else's car and destroying someone else's life. That is what happens when you go at that speed.

Fifty-five saves fuel. It also saves lives. Let us hear it from a Minnesota Highway Patrol officer who has been involved for many years protecting lives and promoting safety on the highways. He said:

Jim, if we raise the speed limit to 65, people will drive 75. There is a whole generation of drivers out there who haven't ex-

perienced consistent higher speeds above 55 miles an hour. They don't know how to handle it.

He went on to say:

It's the speed over 65 that kills. That is when you see the torn aortas when you go in to pull people from a wreck.

That is what we are talking about, saving lives, saving the innocent who do not want to be killed by someone else whose car went out of control because they could not handle that excessive speed.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to save the innocent. Let us keep the 55-mile speed limit.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not to raise the speed limit is not the question. It is, rather, whether or not to allow the States to continue to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous domination by the Congress on States rights.

In a recent poll that I included in my questionnaire throughout the district where 215,000 households had the opportunity to answer this question, we got a representative sampling of more than 15,000 responses. The question was posed: "Do you favor a Federal law that allows the States to increase the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit?"

The response was no, 39 percent. And yes, and also yes but only on interstates, a combination of 60 percent.

So the people in our area—and I believe that is representative of 90 percent of the districts in the United States—say they favor allowing the States to decide their own fortunes with respect to the speed limit.

I myself am very wary of raising the limit from 55 to 65 for personal reasons, but I do believe I am properly reflecting the substantial majority of the people whom I represent in supporting this resolution and allowing Pennsylvania, in my case, and your States, in your case, to determine the future of this issue.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER].

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, our whole debate today boils down to one point: Who is best qualified to make the decisions that affect average citizens' daily lives?

This is no simple question. In fact, the framers of the Constitution labored long and hard over this particular point 200 years ago.

Let us not ignore the wisdom of the compromise forged in the constitutional convention. In the day to day lives



of their citizens, the States are best able to, and should govern.

Rural Texas bears few similarities to downtown Manhattan. More vehicles cross the 14th Street Bridge here in Washington in a rush hour than make the drive between Amarillo and Wichita Falls in my district in a month. Conditions vary. Let's recognize that conditions among the several States do vary.

In making our regulations on other issues, we take into account varying conditions. We realize the differences between smokestack industries and cottage industries when we make our commerce laws. Why don't we on this issue?

There is little doubt in my mind that 55 saves lives and fuel in many metropolitan areas. But it is neither effective nor efficient to make policy for the whole Nation just by observing the conditions in one region.

Yet that is precisely what we have done. Today, let's allow the official with the best view of the situation to make the call. Let's follow the wisdom of our forefathers, which we did until 1974, and let more qualified State officials make the best decisions. I urge your support of this resolution.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment, and in support of retaining the 55-mile-per-hour national speed limit.

I urge the Members to reject the emotional arguments that have been raised and base their decisions on common sense and the facts. Anyone who is old enough to remember when speed limits were 65 miles per hour or 70 miles per hour knows that many people also violated those speed limits. The main difference is that when those speed limits were exceeded, people were driving at 70 to 75 miles per hour instead of 60 miles per hour as they do now.

That difference is very important because, according to the National Safety Council, the chances of a person being killed in a car crash doubles with each 10 miles per hour of speed over 55 miles per hour.

I think there is little about that if we vote to raise the speed limit we are voting to kill and maim more people. The number of additional deaths has been estimated by various groups to be between 500 to 1,000 extra deaths per year if we raise the speed limit to 65 on the rural interstates.

That is like causing a vote in favor of crashing one or two Boeing 747's every year.

We must also consider the dollar impact of this decision as well. As chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee I can tell you that raising the speed limit is

going to cost the Federal Government more in terms of support for emergency medical services, support for shock-trauma care, and a host of related medical infrastructure costs that would be necessary to take care of the increased death and injuries that will result on our highways. It costs this Government enormous sums to treat and rehabilitate the injured. According to the National Academy of Sciences, motor vehicle crash injuries cost the Federal Government about \$7.5 billion and State governments about \$3.5 billion in direct payments and revenue losses. The last thing we need now is to add to those costs.

Mr. Speaker, from a moral standpoint, from a cost standpoint, from a common sense standpoint, the national speed limit should not be raised. As the National Academy of Sciences says the 55 speed limit is "One of the most effective highway safety policies ever adopted."

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT] for rejecting efforts to raise the speed limit.

Mr. Speaker, there are many laws—especially traffic laws—that are not overwhelmingly popular. I do not think we will ever be able to convince all Americans that this speed limit—or any speed limit—is appropriate. But the fact that such laws may be unpopular to some is not a good enough reason in and of itself to change the law. And neither is the argument that this law ought to be changed because the highway patrol doesn't enforce it. The highway patrol does not make national transportation safety policy—the Congress does. The speed limit can be adequately enforced. There is no secret about how to do it.

We must not tamper with important laws that save lives. The proponents of raising the speed limit have not made their case.

I urge the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, as an old States-righter, I rise today to speak in support of the amendment to allow the States flexibility in the application of the Federal interstate speed limit. I want to congratulate and commend the chairman of the Public Works Committee, Mr. HOWARD, for accepting the Senate's position on the "four R" formula, which takes into consideration the needs of rural States like mine to maintain open highways with lighter traffic conditions. I also commend my colleague from Utah's First District, Mr. HANSEN, and my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY], and my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] for their leadership on this amendment to permit the higher speed limit.

The State of Utah, like many Western States, has a few urban areas scattered across a rural countryside. I represent the people of Salt Lake County, the principal urban area. My constituents travel to and from work on interstates that will not be affected by this amendment. When they go shopping, they travel on interstates that will not be affected by this amendment. But when they travel to other cities, or to one of our national parks or recreation areas, or out of State, they travel on long, open stretches of highway. Utah has only 127 miles of urban interstate, but it has over 700 miles of rural interstate with lighter traffic conditions and very few interchanges. Why should the same speed limit be applied to these rural stretches of highway?

This amendment does not permit raising the speed limit on urban interstate highways. It does not require raising the speed limit on rural interstate highways. This amendment simply allows the States, with rural areas, flexibility in applying the speed limit. It allows people in States like Utah the ability to travel on urban highways at speed that is appropriate for urban highways, and on rural highways at a speed that is appropriate for rural highways. I urge your support for the passage of the amendment.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD].

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I plan to vote for House Concurrent Resolution 77 because it is a step in the right direction toward returning to the States their jurisdiction in deciding questions of highway safety and speed limits on interstate highways.

The day-to-day responsibility for highway safety rests in the hands of the States. Yet they cannot make decisions on speed limits because we have a Federal law that says if you permit your citizens to travel faster than 55 miles per hour on your highways, the Federal Government will withhold important highway funds. So now, the States are getting smart in how they measure and certify their citizens are obeying the law. As recent articles in the Washington Post have reported, State officials are locating speed measuring devices at points along interstates where lower speeds occur naturally.

This has turned into a cat and mouse game that is wasting the taxpayers' money, money that could be better spent in safety checks of trucks or other highway safety programs that have a better payoff in terms of protecting the driving public.

An article in yesterday's USA Today by Stephen D. Easton, describes I-94 in North Dakota as a drive with the following: "No mountains, curves, or

significant hills, and very sparse traffic." This is a four-lane highway linking Bismarck and Fargo. As a Member of Congress who has never had the opportunity to visit North Dakota, I do not feel that I am in a position to mandate to North Dakotans how fast they can drive on I-94. I am, however, an authority on I-24 from Paducah to Fort Campbell, KY, as are members of the Kentucky General Assembly. Why should Members of Congress be the ones to decide the speed limit in States which many of us have never visited? Many Governors and State legislators are in agreement with me that they are the ones most familiar with their State's roads and should be the ones to set their own speed limits. I sincerely believe that my senators and representatives in the Kentucky State Legislature will utilize their good judgment should they be given the opportunity to vote to allow an increase in the speed limit on rural interstates.

Further, my constituents have voiced their opinions of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Taking a sample of 10,000 responses to a recent February 1987 questionnaire sent to my constituents, the results are clear. Seventy-two percent of my Kentucky constituents strongly favor raising the interstate speed limit in nonurban sections of interstate highways.

Western Kentucky is highly rural. The prospect of driving for miles on lightly traveled roads at 55 miles per hour is highly aggravating for my constituents. It is time that we return to the individual States their right to represent their residents on this particular issue.

□ 1720

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the Members to listen to this story. I just had a friend of mine not long ago, he said, I am driving along at 62 miles an hour and I get picked up. He said, I cannot believe it; I have never had an accident in my life and I get picked up and he tells me this is two times I have been picked up in the same location and I am going to lose my license and they are going to take my insurance away. I cannot believe it; I have never had an accident in my life.

I did not see him for about 3 months and I said where have you been. He said I have been in the hospital. I said what happened to you and he said that I lost my license and right after that I am driving my car and I have an accident, I do not have any insurance and I end up in the hospital.

It is obvious what the moral of the story is: He happened to be picked up when he was driving too fast and this one time when he did not expect it, he

looks up to answer the telephone, his wife called him to find out how he was doing because he had not been well that morning, he answers the telephone and has an accident and goes into the hospital.

If he had been driving a little bit slower, maybe he would not have had that accident. Now, I am driving along many times and I see people passing me. These is no question about it; it is frustrating. But I can remember when we passed the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit at the national level why we did it. We did it to conserve energy. There is no question about it. If you look at the facts, it conserves energy.

Now, you can say well, let the person go out and pay for more if he wants to drive faster. He gets less miles per gallon. That is not the point. We are right back where we started when it comes to the amount of energy we import today. The facts themselves say there are less accidents when you drive slower. The facts say that there is more conservation when you drive slower.

One of the things about States rights is very interesting. It is interesting to me that some of the people are saying States ought to have the right. I remember the vote on letting the Governors decide on whether the National Guard should train down in Central America. Some of those same people that are saying give the Governors the right to decide what the situation is, they said, "No, no; the Federal Government has to decide and let those National Guard people train anywhere they want to."

So, if you look at the facts, and the facts are that if you drive 55, you have less of a chance of having an accident. If you are injured, you will sustain less of an injury. It will be less expensive to the taxpayer and will conserve energy.

I urge the Members to support JIM HOWARD and BUD SHUSTER who have done such an outstanding job. I know, since we already voted for the bill, that nobody will then turn around and vote against this just because the conference report is already taken care of. I know JIM WRIGHT and BUD SHUSTER will never forget the people who vote for them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention these points:

#### POINT NO. 1

First, speed limit was enacted in 1974 as an energy conservation step.

Second, in recent years we've dismantled almost the entire energy priority program, but automobiles were always the biggest user of fuel, and the place where conservation remains most vital.

Third, energy picture:

In no month in 1986 were imports less than 30 percent of our oil supplies; monthly high was nearly 45 percent;

Domestic production is down; and

Interior Secretary Hodel says we'll be back in gas lines in 5 years—even if it's 10 or 20 years, we're headed down the same road as the 1970's—can't afford to step backward on energy conservation.

#### POINT NO. 2

First, the lower speed limit saves lives.

Second, the National Academy of Sciences estimates 2,000 to 4,000 lives a year are saved by 55 mile-per-hour limit; in addition, paralyzing injuries are prevented.

Third, all safety groups back the 55-mile-per-hour limit.

#### POINT NO. 3

First, what's the tradeoff? Studies show raising the speed limit would save the average driver 1 minute per day.

Second, is that worth the loss of lives and injuries?

Third, is that worth the extra energy consumed?

Fourth, if we raise the speed limit, we will be looking back 5 years from now with accidents and deaths up; and the oil noose slowly tightening around America's neck, wondering why we ever raised the limit.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. CHENEY].

Mr. CHENEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this proposal. We in the West are now demonstrating how very important this particular issue is to us and to our constituents. We are a determined group and we are prepared to continue to work hard to come up with some sort of agreement that will modify the federally mandated 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

I think most people would agree that certain decisions should remain the prerogative of the individual States. I have great trust in State government and believe those elected officials are in the best position to make judgments about what is best for their particular States. This is the case with the speed limit. If you drive the stretch of Interstate 80 from Cheyenne to Rock Springs—roughly the same distance as from New York City to Boston—you will know how very different driving is in the West. According to the Wyoming Highway Department, the average daily traffic count on this stretch of road is 6,350 vehicles. Compare this with the busy New York to Boston corridor of Route 95. There is one spot on Route 95 near Bridgeport, CT, where the average daily traffic count is 141,000 vehicles. Our Western rural interstates are uncrowded, straight and safe. The legislators in Cheyenne know this—just as the legislators in Hartford know the conditions on Route 95. In fact, the Wyoming Legislature passed a resolution during this past session which urges us to return this power to the States. This resolution gives States the option of raising the speed limit on



rural interstates and I think it's a step in the right direction.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this provision. Vote to turn the business of making traffic laws back to the States.

We do not ask that the Federal Government repeal the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit altogether, or that the States be required to raise the speed limit to 65. We do ask that the States be given the right to determine for themselves whether 65 miles per hour is more appropriate than 55 on certain rural interstates.

The question at hand is whether the States can be trusted to make the best decision about the appropriate speed limits for their interstates, or whether we in Washington should have to make that decision for the States. I think that the closer to home those decisions are made, the better.

According to the Nebraska Department of Roads, 76 percent of Nebraska drivers exceeded the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on interstate highways in 1985.

This is not because Nebraska drivers are scofflaws, or because Nebraskans have no interest in highway safety.

It's because Nebraska interstates are designed to be driven on at 70 miles per hour, and because a driver can travel from one end of the State to the other without turning his steering wheel more than 5 degrees in either direction. It just doesn't make sense to drive 55 miles per hour on Nebraska interstates.

And of course, what is appropriate for Nebraska is not necessarily appropriate for California, Pennsylvania, or New Jersey. But a federally mandated, uniform speed limit assumes that driving conditions are the same in every region of the country—and that's just not the case.

I think this provision addresses this problem. This provision would allow—not require—the individual States to increase the speed limit to 65 miles per hour, but only on interstate routes in rural areas. The speed limit would be increased only if the Governor approves of the increase and if the interstates are of sufficient quality to bear traffic at higher speed.

This is one of the most sensible, reasonable things to come to this floor in a long time. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have the dubious distinction today of discussing the speed limit issue from the perspective of a

representative of the only State in the Union that's been fined for noncompliance with the national maximum speed limit law. In fact, we've been in noncompliance in 2 of the last 4 years. According to the research of the National Safety Council, you'd guess that our fatality rate on Arizona rural interstates, where our drivers are most likely to break the speed limit, would have risen noticeably. I'm afraid it's just not so.

In 1982, my State passed what is called the "petty offense law." With this, anyone driving between 56 and 65 miles per hour is fined \$15 and given no points on their driver's license—hardly a fine at all. The average highway speed in Arizona has been steadily increasing ever since. But I think it's very revealing that in the 4 years since passage of the petty offense law, the death rates on our rural interstates fell by 55 percent compared to the 4 years prior to enactment of the law. The lesson here is clear. You can take your random statistical estimates, and it just doesn't compare to actual reality.

Fifty-five miles per hour only saves lives in areas where traffic, road conditions, and the whole variety of factors detract from overall road safety. We're not proposing raising the speed limit where it's not appropriate. There are areas where it is. But there are many areas where it isn't and to base a Federal enforcement program on an arbitrary speed limit is an injustice to States like Arizona, where conditions allow for higher speeds without a commensurate decrease in safety.

There are other aspects that don't make sense. The compliance monitoring sites in Arizona and everywhere in the country are located randomly. In Arizona, 14 of the 37 sites are located in areas where there is no speed limit enforcement by our highway patrol. The highway patrol must concentrate enforcement in areas where speed contributes to fatalities. We have monitors in areas where traffic is so light and accident experience is so low that we cannot afford the manpower in those areas. This makes no sense.

Highway patrol discretion is another example of how this law has failed in Arizona. The Arizona Highway Patrol originally had a policy that motorists exceeding 60 miles per hour would be given a citation automatically. But their policy and reality were two separate things. In actuality, the number of vehicles exceeding 65, where enforcement is necessary and important, was adequate to keep the patrol busy. As a result, motorists driving between 55 and 65 have been totally ignored by the highway patrol.

When Congress passes laws that the people won't obey and our policemen can't enforce, we can either blame the people or we can blame the law. As a representative of the people of Arizo-

na, it's clear to me what the people are saying. It's time to change the law.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution that would, in my mind put motorists on a collision course with increased traffic fatalities and injuries. As we debate whether to increase the speed limits on rural interstate highways, an undeniable statistic looms large. Lower speed limits on our highways have led to fewer deaths and fewer serious injuries.

In Ohio, the Department of Highway Safety and the State Highway Patrol strongly support keeping the speed limit at 55 miles per hour. The statistics in Ohio vividly illustrate the effectiveness of the 55 speed limit in reducing highway deaths and injuries.

In addition, the American Trucking Association has gone on record in support of the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit. Again, safety is the reason cited for keeping the present speed limit. According to the transportation research board, 4,334 lives have been saved and 73,711 injuries prevented in motor carrier accidents as a result of the 55 speed limit over the past 11 years.

For the 8-year period before the national 55 mile-per-hour speed limit law was enacted, rural interstate highway traffic deaths in Ohio averaged 105 each year. For the 12 years since, the death toll has been cut nearly in half, to an average of 57 deaths each year. Total rural highway traffic deaths in Ohio reflect similar dramatic savings of life during this same period. From 1962 to 1973, Ohio rural traffic deaths averaged 1,588 annually. Since 1974, the average has dropped to 1,172 deaths annually.

Clearly, the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit has proven to be one of the most effective tools ever introduced in traffic safety management and it has the full support of law enforcement authorities across Ohio.

Another compelling reason for keeping the 55 speed limit is the need for energy conservation. Memories of the gas lines in the 1970's must not be forgotten. Our Nation's dependence on foreign oil is again on the rise, thanks in large measure to increased consumption and decreased domestic drilling and exploration.

Let's not foolishly plunge into another energy crisis simply because we lack the foresight to conserve. I can speak from personal experience that driving 55 miles per hour is a gas saver. By keeping the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, we will conserve on fuel.

Twelve years ago, Congress chose to make the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit permanent because it believed the sav-

ings of lives was far more important than any other consideration. Today that consideration should not be changed. Today, we have the opportunity to affirm our support for this proven lifesaver. Our citizens are counting on us to act wisely.

□ 1730

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution which will allow States the opportunity to increase the speed limit on rural interstates to 65 miles per hour. This amendment does not mandate an increase in the speed limit. It allows States the opportunity to increase the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on those rural interstates that they, the States, determine are capable of handling an increase in speed. This is where the decision should be made—by the Governors and State legislators who know their States and know the roads on which the speed can be increased safely.

Today, the House of Representatives will cast a historic vote to correct a law which has become impossible to support. A good law is one which serves a purpose and fulfills a need. A bad law is one which is ignored to the extent that it becomes unenforceable. Anyone who drives on interstate highways knows that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has turned our country into a Nation of lawbreakers. This vote represents the first step to correct the situation.

Many here today have stated that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has, since its enactment in 1974, drastically decreased fatalities on our Nation's highways. I will not dispute that lower speeds have contributed to lower fatalities. However, I do believe that other factors have also contributed to reduced fatalities during the same time period. Several studies have been done on this issue. The point of these studies is that decreased fatality rates on our Nation's highways are not solely the result of lower speed limits. Certainly, traveling at a slower rate of speed can and does contribute to a lessening of the severity of many collisions. However, improvements in road construction, improvements in automobile engineering, mandatory seat-belt laws, and the national war against drunk drivers also play a significant and important role in highway safety.

The opponents of an increase in the speed limit are saying that if we raise the speed limit, it will just cause motorists to exceed the new speed limit in the same numbers. I don't think so. I think that if we set the speed limit realistically, drivers will respect the law and law enforcement officers will enforce the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit.

I personally believe that setting the speed limit is best left up to the States, whose highway patrols are charged with enforcement of the law. In spite of this, I'm willing to compromise with this amendment, because I think that it is one which all of us, from the urban East to the wide open spaces in the West, can live with.

I urge all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to vote for this amendment, and to take this important step to allow motorists on rural interstates to live within the law.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House of Representatives to join the Senate in voting to give States the option to raise to 65 miles per hour the speed limit on rural interstate highways.

Our national policy should be designed to strike the best balance among our goals of saving lives, saving energy, making travel convenient, and respecting the sound judgment of our States. These goals are no different from those we had in 1974, when the 55-mile-per-hour national speed limit was adopted, but we know more now than we did then, and we can strike a better balance today.

We now have 13 years of experience with the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and a dozen studies on it. We know that it has, in most respects, served our Nation well. On most roads, it is the best way to save lives, save energy, and make travel convenient. That is why it makes sense to retain the 55-mile-per-hour limit for fully 94 percent of the roads now subject to it—urban and suburban interstates, and rural highways other than interstates—as will be done if we adopt the Senate provision.

We also know, from our personal experience and from the views of transportation experts, that our rural interstates, especially those in the West, are different from other roads. Only these rural interstates, which make up about 6 percent of the Nation's highways, would be affected by the proposal before us. But these rural interstates are unique and should be treated differently.

The first and most important way rural interstates differ from other roads is that they are safer. America's rural interstates are the safest roads ever built—so much so that keeping the speed limit at 55 miles per hour doesn't make them much safer. As Lowell B. Jackson, the executive director of the Colorado Department of Highways, stated in a letter to me last week:

Concerning highway safety, the fatalities on Colorado's rural Interstates have remained fairly constant over the past two decades, with or without the 55 mph speed limit \* \* \*. Thus it would seem—if the speed limit is raised on the rural Interstate highways only—there would be minimal impact concerning highway safety.

The second way rural interstates are unique is that they are used primarily by people driving long distances. The advantages of raising the speed limit would be even greater than on roads used for shorter trips, where the time saved would usually just be a minute or two

per trip. This is especially so in the West, where the distances between population centers and other destinations is greater. The distance between Denver and Salt Lake City is greater than the distance between Washington, DC, and Detroit.

Finally, the measure we are voting on today would not itself raise the speed limit, but would instead authorize the States to do so. I am confident that the States care as much as the Federal Government does about protecting people's lives, and will exercise care and restraint when they decide which rural interstates are safe enough to accommodate faster traffic. This was emphasized by Mr. Jackson in his letter to me:

The Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE] adopted the following policy in 1985: "It is the policy of the ITE to support exceptions to the national maximum speed limit of 55 mph when traffic engineering and safety studies clearly indicate that the benefits, including safety, will be higher than the identifiable adverse impacts." A special ITE task force was formed and recently developed suggested guidelines to help determine where the 55 mph speed limit could be raised \* \* \*.

One of the recommendations I found to be especially important deals with engineering and traffic studies. The ITE task force stresses, "It is important that each potential (highway) segment be thoroughly analyzed, with relevant roadway conditions, traffic characteristics, operational features and safety considerations adequately documented."

This communication from Colorado's top highway official makes it clear that my State will be careful to raise the speed limit only where local conditions make it appropriate. I believe other States will as well.

Mr. Speaker, we can learn from our experience and from the experts, and safely raise the speed limit on selected rural interstates. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to make this change in our national policy.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. MARLENEE).

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this very important amendment for the people of the West.

Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to overturn the most ignored and ineffective law in America—the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Established through blackmail, and maintained through coercion, the national 55-mile-per-hour law has been more widely disobeyed than prohibition was 60 years ago.

The big argument tossed around in support of the 55-mile-per-hour limit is that it saves lives. Sure it does. So let's all slow down further. Let's all walk. Get rid of cars and walk. That's about as safe as you can get. Better yet, let's crawl—there's less chance of accidents.

Let's overturn the unneeded, unwanted and disobeyed 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Just like prohibition, the 55-mile-per-hour is a failed Federal experiment.

It's time to turn over State highway safety to those people who know it best; the States. I



have consistently fought to repeal the national speed limit and I have introduced legislation repealing the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Each State should be allowed to establish its own, rightful speed limit law. States rights dictate each State to be allowed to set its own speed limit, and States rights also dictate we abolish any law established through blackmail.

Let's not limit the speed, rather let's limit Federal involvement in State's rights. In recent years, as Montanans continued to ignore the Federal force-fed 55-mile-per-hour speed limit law in record numbers. And what were the results? Fewer Montanans were killed in traffic accidents than any year since 1960.

Today over 40 percent of the Nation's drivers ignore the speed limit. Let's not continue to ignore this problem of widespread disrespect for this Federal law, let's get rid of 55.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been often said around here that whenever all else fails, just look at the facts.

I submit that this is the only issue that we will debate in the House of Representatives in which the facts are clearly on only one side. They cannot be misconstrued or used by both sides to bring out a point.

The facts show that 55 saves lives. That fact alone should make this vote the most simple one in the session for all of us.

The issue is mere minutes shaved versus lives saved. Let us not ignore that. Let us not ignore the fact that with the States having the flexibility as the resolution would call for that there would be indeed increased pressure upon States that should not raise their speed limit to 65 miles an hour to do just that if all their neighboring States are raising their speed limit to 65 miles per hour.

We are actually talking about, Mr. Speaker, speed limits of 75 or 80 miles per hour. That is the real issue here today, because we know truly that if we raise the speed limit to 65 that that is the speed limit individuals will be driving. I urge that we keep it at 55.

The option we have before us today is especially objectionable. What we are voting on today is whether or not to allow States to raise their speed limit with no additional safety or compliance standards.

Keep in mind that this is an entirely different provision than the one defeated last Congress which would have instituted a pilot project to raise the speed limit in limited areas for a limited period of time.

In my home State of West Virginia, we have 407 miles of rural interstate highways which could be affected by this provision. As anyone who has ever traveled in this mountainous State well knows, many of our roads have extremely steep grades and severe curves. And anyone who has ever

made that memorable trip in the rain and fog from Charleston to Beckley along the West Virginia Turnpike can testify to the advisability of slower, safe speed limits. It is for obvious reasons that West Virginia's 1986 compliance rate for the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit was the best in the Nation at approximately 75 percent.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN].

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of just how far removed the Congress of the United States is from the people they represent. Oftentimes we are asked, "Just how far are you removed from us?"

This shows that we are about 32,000 feet removed from them. That is, most Members of Congress because of our requirement to get back to our districts and back here to Washington, DC, take the airplane. We are flying above it all. We are flying above the West. We are not there as the average American is with his family trying to drive to a national park and when people say that it is more dangerous to go 65, what is the danger factor if you require them to go 55 instead of 65 when they are going 550 miles? That adds an additional 1½ hours to driving. Is someone going to tell me that adding an additional hour and a half at the end of a driving day does not make it more unsafe?

This is a fundamental question. Are you going to allow people to do what they want to do in a reasonable fashion through their elected Representatives?

It may be something in New Jersey and Washington, DC. It is very different in Nevada, California, Arizona, and Utah.

Let us just be truthful with the people and let them have something that they want, a little bit of freedom.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in opposition to this amendment.

I do not understand why we are driving 75 to get this thing done when there is no need to do it. For those who are concerned that they will not have a chance to really work on 65, and I can see some situations in rural West Virginia that interstate traffic might bear that, but I know also that the Public Works Committee has kept its word. The Public Works Committee today began holding hearings on this very subject. Hearings that will bring out the information we need to make an informed decision.

I also know that what you are voting on today is not what you voted on a few months ago. That was much more restrictive. This would open it up.

Why not hold the hearings? Why not see what safety considerations

there are, what fuel considerations there are; for instance, like the Department of Energy study just yesterday that says that by 1990 we will be 50 percent, not 38 percent like we were in the seventies, but 50 percent dependent upon foreign oil sources. Let us get all that data in and then act on 65 and make it a safe bill as well as one that also deals with our fuel consumption and our other problems. We can make the adjustments that are necessary, but I think we could do it in a little more orderly fashion.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I just would like to make a couple of very quick points. In the State of California both the highway patrol and the Department of Transportation, both of which have a commitment to safety that certainly parallels the commitment that we have, are in support of increasing the speed limit on certain highways.

It has also become very clear that we in this House are not the ones who will be responsible for enforcement. It will lie with the States.

I believe we have a strong obligation to let them play a role in the decision-making process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment to give to the States more discretion in setting speed limits. We have spent nearly as much time studying and debating this issue as we have issues of national security. Today, once again, we will trade statistics showing how 55 has or has not saved lives, whether the fuel savings are significant, whether the public really supports the current speed limit, ad infinitum.

Some points are not in question, however. For one, interstates comprise only about 7 percent of all U.S. highways, and the rural portions on which the speed limit could be raised are an even smaller portion. We are not talking about a wholesale abandonment of the national speed limit—only permitting some flexibility on a small portion of our highways.

Second, we should remember that whatever speed limit we decide to set, we won't have to enforce it—the States will. Apparently, they are finding 55 unenforceable on some roads. Why don't we defer to their judgment?

Opponents of this amendment have gone so far as to state that, by giving the States more control over this matter, we will be directly responsible for 5,000 deaths. That is pure absurdity, and State authorities know better. The director of the South Dakota Highway Patrol said it best:

Why must I have a trooper stationed on an interstate at ten in the morning worried about a guy driving sixty on a system designed for seventy?

He wonders. He points out that the same trooper could be out on a Friday night watching for drunk drivers, a problem which we have acknowledged causes more fatalities than speeding itself.

In my own State of California, which has more cars than any other State, both the highway patrol and the Department of Transportation have endorsed raising the speed limit to 65 on certain highways. I believe that those agencies know better than this body which roads could handle slightly higher speeds. I also believe their commitment to safety is no less than ours.

We have talked about this issue long enough—let's give flexibility a chance to work. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to allow States to raise the speed limit from 55 to 65 miles per hour on interstate highways outside urbanized areas of 50,000 population or more. Nebraskans have written to me to urge me to support an increase of the speed limit by a 3-to-1 majority.

Mr. Speaker, Federal Highway Administration statistics indicate that 54.2 percent of the vehicles in Nebraska exceed the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit. However, this is not the result of Nebraskans being any less law abiding than other folks in the country—it is the result of an outdated Federal mandate that unnecessarily constrains vehicles in rural areas like Nebraska.

By giving the Governors the discretion to increase the speed limit only on rural interstates outside urban areas of 50,000 or more, we do not contravene safety considerations. The 55-mile-per-hour speed limit will be maintained in densely populated areas, and I have utmost faith in the Governors to act with responsibility and discretion in designating stretches of interstate for an increase from 55 to 65.

Mr. Speaker, allowing the States to decide on the speed limit issue restores federalism ideals and will allow those individuals traveling on rural interstates to use their time more effectively. I urge the Members' support.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the confusion, but we asked the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma to close the debate on our side and out of deference to our dear chairman, he is going to actually close the overall debate.

Mr. Speaker, I know this is a very difficult vote for some Members because certainly when it comes to safety and losing lives, this is a matter that concerns all of us; but let me tell you that as late as this morning at 11 o'clock, the Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation appeared before our committee and here is a copy of his testimony. His name is Philip Haseltine. He is the Deputy Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Transportation. He is quoting a 1984 study by the National Academy of Sciences. Now, who do we want to believe? People pick things out of newspapers, people hear this,

people hear that, talking to this person and that person, here is a study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences and here is what they said:

We have no data which specifically supports or disputes the 500 lives estimate,

That has been bandied around.

□ 1740

In closing arguments we are going to hear all kinds of numbers. Mr. Speaker, what is causing the carnage on the highways of America is primarily drinking drivers. Over 50 percent of all the fatalities and the wrecks, particularly on the Interstate System, are caused by people drinking.

Now I do not want to be facetious, but if a person is drinking and he cannot see the road, you know that he cannot see the speedometer. So it is not going to make any difference to him whether it is 55 or 65.

The American people are rebelling in the rural areas of this country against 55, and if you do not believe it, go out here on any one of them and watch the trucks and the cars zip by.

What we are trying to do is make people legitimate. What we are trying to do is bring some sanity to the roads of America, and we are merely saying here, "Let's make it permissive. What's wrong with your Governor and your legislature determining what happens in your State."

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Members will vote "aye" on the concurrent resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, Congressman JIM HOWARD, in the House position in opposing the Senate proposal to increase the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstate highways. I do so because countless studies have demonstrated that a maximum speed limit of 55 miles an hour has saved thousands of lives. It also has helped the American motorist conserve fuel. This was particularly important in the 1970's when OPEC had a stranglehold on our petroleum supplies. It could be important once again if our Nation experiences another scarcity in energy resources.

The most important reason for my continued support of a uniform speed limit of 55 miles per hour is safety. The Michigan Safety Commission supports this position. The National Safety Council estimates that 3,000 to 4,000 lives are saved each year due to the lower maximum speed limit. The Michigan State Police estimate that 200 to 300 lives are saved annually in Michigan by the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit. Undoubtedly, this also results in a savings in health costs for Michigan and its people.

The light of these statistics, I question the wisdom of whether Congress should deviate from a current maximum speed limit policy proven to save lives, reduce injuries, and increase safety on our Nation's roads, without putting in place a corresponding policy requiring mandatory seatbelt laws, coupled with a substantially increased seatbelt use rate, in those States which adopt the higher maximum speed limit.

Those States which have already adopted mandatory seatbelt use laws have realized remarkable declines of highway deaths and injuries. When Michigan's mandatory seatbelt law was enacted in 1985, it was estimated that a use level of 70 percent would save 300 lives and reduce serious injuries by 8,000 to 10,000 annually. Public opinion surveys conducted both before and after the effective date of the law showed strong public support for the safety belt law. Although the Michigan seatbelt use rate has not reached 70 percent, the increased belt use has resulted in decreased death rates, and a substantial drop in highway related injuries.

The Senate proposal before us today is deficient. While bowing to claims of many that the public is now driving at this higher speed, it ignores the serious safety problem. It fails to include a major safety requirement which would reduce the risk created by higher speeds. Had the Senate proposal included a sound requirement for mandatory seatbelt laws and increased belt usage, my position on this proposal might very well have been different.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Symms amendment to give States the option of raising the speed limit on rural interstates to 65 miles per hour.

Many pertinent issues have been raised on this issue by both supporters and opponents of the current 55-miles-per-hour speed limit. I would like to address what I see as the three critical issues in this debate: States rights, energy conservation, and highway safety.

Federal preemption of a State's right to set speed limits has occurred twice in our Nation's history. During World War II, a national speed limit of 35 miles per hour was imposed to conserve fuel for the Armed Forces. Again, in 1974, the driving force behind the 55 limit was conservation, not safety. At the time, the lower limit was needed because the oil embargo had left the Nation in a virtual state of emergency.

I do not believe that our current energy situation warrants continued Federal preemption of State decisions on the speed limit. National conservation measures have greatly reduced our vulnerability to a supply disruption similar to the 1973 oil embargo. Our automobiles, our homes and our industries are more energy efficient. We have established the strategic petroleum reserve to guard against a sudden disruption of Mideast oil supplies.

These long-term conservation measures must continue. I support the retention of corporate average fuel efficiency [CAFE] standards for automobiles, as they have been tremendously successful in improving the overall efficiency of American automobiles and reducing national gasoline consumption. We must continue to invest in energy efficiency improvements in our infrastructure that will produce long-term conservation gains.

Unlike these long-term conservation measures, which have long timetables for implementation, speed limits can be quickly and easily lowered if we find ourselves with a national fuel crisis again.

Highway safety is predominantly a State issue. That doesn't mean that it isn't a legitimate concern of every Member of Congress.



Nor does that mean that the Federal Government has no role at all. The Federal Government continues to make substantial investments in highway safety through the Highway Hazard Elimination Program. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration also conducts research into making our highways, bridges, and rail crossings safer, and its sets minimum safety requirements for automobiles.

All of these efforts, both Federal and State, have been paying off in terms of saving lives. Highway fatalities per million passenger miles have been declining steadily since the 1960's.

Supporters of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit tend to give all the credit for fatality reductions to the lower speed limit. In several States, however, compliance with the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has been steadily declining over the past several years, but so, too, have fatalities. People are driving faster, yet the highways are safer.

The Symms amendment will not mandate that States raise their speed limits. Many States have already said they will not do so. It bothers me that some of my colleagues believe that Congress places a greater value on human life than do State lawmakers. I do not believe this is the case. Each State lawmaker will have to weigh the merits of raising the speed limit, based upon highway safety data collected in his or her State.

Congress must recognize regional differences when weighing the speed limit question. Since road conditions differ widely, States are in a much better position to determine what speeds best suit their individual circumstances.

The 55 law is breeding contempt for the Federal Government in every State west of the Mississippi, and many in the East as well. It has generated widespread motorist contempt for speed limit regulations.

Let's stop pretending that we in Washington know more than the folks back home. I urge all Members to join me in supporting the Symms amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will adopt this resolution to allow States to raise the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates.

Although this resolution does not address the central issue—federally set speed limits—it is a step in the right direction. We should actually get the Federal Government out of the business of setting speed limits altogether, and put that responsibility back where it belongs—at the State level.

Mr. Speaker, the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit has been a farce. The Washington Post, in a recent article on enforcement of the speed limit in Maryland, pointed out that, in 1985, 90 percent of drivers were violating the national 55-mile-per-hour law. But in 1986, the statistics suddenly changed. Less than half were exceeding the 55-mile-per-hour limit. Why the dramatic change?

The Post reports that it was not because of sudden compliance by motorists, but because of changes in reporting by State authorities. Maryland "simply moved several of its roadside speed monitoring machines to places where traffic is slower—such as hills, curves, and in congested areas. It also started measuring speeds on rainy days when traffic typically is slower."

Not to single out the State of Maryland, the Post notes that "all of this was done with the blessing of the Federal Government and comes long after all the 49 other States had done the same thing." Well, all but Arizona.

Federal guidelines allowing monitors on hills, curves, and congested areas have been on the books since 1981 when Congress voted to allow greater flexibility in the placing of monitors.

The 55-mile-per-hour law is likely one of the least respected by our citizens. It makes law breakers of most of us. And the contention that it saves lives is even in question. A recent study by Utah State University's Institute of Political Economy found that the limit has no statistically measurable effect on the number of fatalities per 100 million miles driven on U.S. highways.

The study notes that a simple comparison of the death rate for 1973—the year immediately prior to the speed limit's imposition—with the death rate since then is inappropriate. The current rate of decline actually began in 1967, long before the current speed limit took effect. The institute credits reduced fatalities not to the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, but to safer highways, more miles of interstate highways—which are safer—better traffic controls at intersections, and safer automobiles.

Today, we have an opportunity to respond to the will of the people, who through their calls and letters, and their actions, have clearly indicated that they want this law changed. We can take the first step toward ending Federal involvement in speed limits. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment allowing for an increase of the 55-mile-per-hour maximum speed limit on interstate highways, and I do so for a number of reasons. But this afternoon I want to focus on just the aspect of energy consumption.

I think it would be instructive for all Members to reflect on the energy shortage of the early 1970's that caused Congress to impose the 55 limit on our Nation's highways in the first place. And let's be frank, Congress' action was largely to reduce our dependency on foreign oil. We were spending hours every week, sitting in long lines at gasoline stations, waiting for our chance to refill our tanks. In many areas of the country, motorists were limited to the amount they could purchase. Some States and cities instituted odd/even days. The Federal Government went so far as to print up millions and millions of gasoline rationing coupons.

It took a long time for this country to recover from that shock, both psychologically and economically.

And where are we now? Today the United States imports more oil from foreign sources than it did at the time of the oil embargo—38 percent versus 33 percent. We are more vulnerable now than we were in 1974. And as a result, current domestic production has declined to very low levels. Were we to face a similar cutoff from any one of our major foreign suppliers, the gas lines would appear tomorrow.

If you want to minimize our Nation's reliance on foreign sources of oil, then vote against the increase.

It doesn't take an engineer to understand the relationship between higher speeds and higher consumption.

As it is, most motorists travel faster than the posted limits on interstates today. So, some argue, let's be realistic and increase the limit to reflect today's practices. Well, by the same token it doesn't take a psychologist to realize that if we increase the permissible limit to 65, most drivers will broach that number as well.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to remember the havoc and disruptions that afflicted us during the embargo. It is still a distinct possibility today and will be with us for many, many years to come. Do not be lulled into a false sense of renewed security. We are more vulnerable today than we were in the early 1970's.

We must continue to employ every available means of conservation. Smaller, more efficient cars is one answer. So is more efficient home heating and insulating systems, and more efficient boilers used in industry. But 55 mile per hour is a key component, and one we must preserve.

I encourage all Members to vote against the increase.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 77, the resolution to allow States to raise the speed limit to 65 on rural interstate highways. Our Interstate System was designed for 70-mile-per-hour traffic. The rural interstates have exceptionally low accident rates. And our State Governments are quite capable of determining where a higher speed limit can be authorized without jeopardizing safety.

We are all aware of the much cited Transportation Research Board's correlation between the speed limit and traffic fatalities. We should also consider the Federal Highway Administration's disclosure that 70 percent of drivers today exceed the national speed limit, yet fatalities continue to decline. Couldn't we logically conclude that factors other than the speed limit can be attributed to the decline in highway fatalities?

Improved highway design, increased use of safety belts, stricter penalties for drunk driving, and mandatory vehicle standards have also played a vital role in improved highway safety. Let's give credit where credit is due.

It's time to accept reality and allow our States the flexibility to raise the speed limit where it is appropriate to do so.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the committee leadership's position, and will vote to retain the current 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. The evidence regarding the safety implications of this issue leads me to believe that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit saves lives—and that alone is sufficient reason for me. But the additional fact that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit conserves about 167,000 barrels of oil per day—oil that we would perhaps otherwise be importing from the Persian Gulf—clinches the argument.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal speed limit was adopted in 1973 as an energy conservation measure, during the oil embargo/energy crisis. It was then made permanent in 1974. Many Members today are saying that we don't need to conserve energy today—and to that, I say "nonsense."

We may not have long lines at gas stations, and we may not be complaining about gasoline prices today, but we have a dangerous situation on the horizon unless we maintain and even increase our present energy conservation measures.

Just yesterday, the Department of Energy released its long-awaited Energy Security Study, and it doesn't make very cheerful reading. The report projects U.S. oil imports could rise from the average for 1985 of 5.3 million barrels per day, or 33 percent of U.S. oil consumption, to between 8 and 10 million barrels per day, or 50 percent of U.S. oil consumption by the 1990's. If current trends continue, the United States and the world could become ever more dependent upon the Persian Gulf suppliers, which control about two-thirds of the world's known reserves. The long-term energy and national security implications of such dependence on an unstable region are alarming.

Perhaps even more alarming is the fact that the transportation sector is 97-percent dependent upon oil. If there is an energy shortage, it is this sector that will feel it first and most severely. And for that reason, it is this sector to which we should be devoting our particular attention.

Permitting an increase in the speed limit to 65 miles per hour could result in as much as 167,000 barrels of oil per day in additional consumption. As a Representative from New England, where we are largely dependent upon imported oil already, I can tell you that such an increase is unacceptable.

It is clear that the energy crisis is not in fact over—it may simply be lying dormant. Increasing the speed limit may merely hasten its return.

Even if we weren't concerned about energy conservation—and clearly we should be—we should still support the continuation of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit because it saves lives. The National Safety Council estimates that at least 500 lives are saved annually because of the speed limit, and countless thousands more injuries are avoided or lessened because of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Some people claim that the limit is unenforceable, and that no one observes it anyway. I don't think that's the case. But what I find more sobering are the studies that show how many people wouldn't observe a 65-mile-per-hour speed limit either. Many people make it a practice to drive a set amount over the speed limit, whether it is 7 or 10 or 12 miles above the limit. Raising the limit could simply result in these people driving 75 instead of 65. And that is a prospect that promises to increase accidents, injuries, and deaths. Over 20,000 lives have been saved since 1974 because of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Let's keep saving lives; keep 55.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today the House votes on an amendment to H.R. 2, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. This is an extremely important vote and will determine whether or not States will be allowed to raise the speed limit in certain areas.

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to vote no on this amendment and support retention of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit as a national policy. It has been one of the most effective highway

safety measures ever enacted. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences has estimated that 2,000 to 4,000 American lives continue to be saved each year because of the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

Mr. Speaker, the impetus for increasing the speed limit comes primarily from Western States and yet statistics show that the fatality rate is much higher on those rural interstate highways when compared to the national average. For instance, in 1984, the fatality rate for Nevada was 4.55 while the national average was only 1.44 per 100 million vehicle miles. Utah, Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Colorado, Texas, Wyoming, and California also all had among the highest fatality rates on rural interstates.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about safety on the highways located in my district, particularly on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. The turnpike is narrow, congested, and traveled by a great number of large tractor trailers. Raising the speed limit on this highway would be nothing short of a calamity. More lives would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the impact on noninterstate roads. According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, when motorists travel for long periods at particular speeds, they tend to adapt their speed and travel faster than other motorists when they move to connecting roads with lower speed limits. The debate on this issue has largely ignored this related safety concern. And yet, Mr. Speaker, this could also prove disastrous in my district and many other districts as well.

Mr. Speaker, had this proposal been linked to implementation of safety measures—such as mandatory seatbelt use—I would have been more inclined to support it. Since it is not, I cannot vote for this increase in the speed limit.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the concurrent resolution which seeks to permit States the discretion to raise the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates.

I have joined with my colleague, Hon. DAVE McCURDY in cosponsoring legislation to modify, not repeal the national speed limit. Clearly there exists differences in driving conditions across the country that justify this option. Therefore, I am in agreement that it is time we develop a policy that recognizes these conditions.

My thanks to Representative JAMES J. HOWARD, chairman of the Public Works Committee for agreeing to allow a floor vote on this issue. This bill is important to States and paves the way for individual judgment for the enhancement of public respect for laws relating to safety while traveling.

I respectfully urge the support of my colleagues to advocate a realistic speed law.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, the 55 mile-per-hour speed limit does more than save gas—it saves lives. Since the national speed limit was initiated in 1974, over 500 deaths and 2,000 serious injuries have been prevented each year. Both highway fatality and injury rates have dropped significantly over the past 13 years.

The makers of Federal policy have an obligation to enact reasonable legislation to pro-

mote the health and safety of the American public—and the 55-mile-per-hour limit accomplishes this goal.

We, in Congress, should be guided by the facts. And the fact is that hundreds of people are alive and well today because a reasonable national speed limit is in place.

Opponents of the 55-mile-per-hour limit propose to raise the speed limit only on certain rural interstates. I fear, however, that this is only the first step toward dismantling the national limit. This we cannot allow.

While the safety issue is my primary concern, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to mention that energy conservation considerations have influenced me to support the national 55-mile-per-hour limit.

Even though there are no long lines at the pumps in 1987, energy conservation should still be an important objective of Federal policy. The Iran-Iraq war presents a continuing threat to our Nation's oil supply. The gas saved because of the 55-mile-per-hour limit reduces our national aggregate oil consumption rate and lessens our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to vote to maintain the 55-mile-per-hour limit. We cannot allow the opponents of the 55-mile-per-hour limit to weaken this important national policy.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, today the House is scheduled to vote on House Concurrent Resolution 77 which would allow States the option of raising the national maximum speed limit from 55 to 65 miles per hour on interstate highways outside urbanized areas of 50,000 population or more. I support this measure, however, due to previous commitments in my district, I regret that I will not be here to vote on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the national 55-mile-per-hour speed fails to take into consideration important regional differences. Traffic volume and road conditions differ from State to State, and State governments should have the freedom and authority to deal with those differences. Traditionally regulation of highway speeds has been left to State and local governments—House Concurrent Resolution 77 returns this authority to the States. This concept has not only received the support of numerous State legislatures, but was recently endorsed by the Nation's Governors at the National Governors Association winter meeting.

Some continue to voice their concern over the safety implications of a 65-mile-per-hour limit. However, many highways can safely accommodate traffic traveling at 65-mile-per-hour limit. In addition, the National Transportation Research Board suggests that any adverse effects that might result from raising the speed limit could be successfully countered by the States enacting specific safety measures. The majority of States have already done so by enacting mandatory seatbelt laws, and strict measures against drunk driving and other hazardous violations that do impact on safety.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress the resolution does not mandate raising the speed limit, but returns that judgment to the States. The measure is a modest and reasonable modification of our national maximum



speed limit. Furthermore, I believe it will enhance the motoring public's respect for all laws relating to highway travel and safety.

I hope the House will act judiciously on this matter and approve the measure for enclosure in the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 77, a technical correction in H.R. 2 to allow States to raise the speed limit from 55 to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates outside urbanized areas of 50,000 population or more.

It is time to give the speed limit issue back to the States. This issue is not an issue of how fast we should drive, it is an issue of who should make that decision. In that sense, today's resolution didn't go far enough. It spoke to interstates when it should have said "States, it's up to you to decide." Since the invention of the automobile, speed limits have been a prerogative of the States, 13 years ago the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit became law as a result of a natural crisis—the oil shortage. It was to be a temporary national conservation effort in response to the oil embargo. That crisis is over now and I believe it is time to give the issue of determining speed limits back to the States and localities where it belongs.

Our rural interstate systems are designed and engineered to accommodate traffic up to 70 miles per hour, and these roads carry approximately 19 percent of our Nation's fastest traffic. There are many highways in Colorado that can safely accommodate traffic traveling at 65 miles per hour. In fact, Colorado has 772 miles of rural interstate that would be open for review of speed limits if this amendment passes. I don't think it's appropriate for Congress to tell Coloradans how fast or slowly they should drive.

This is not a partisan issue. This should not be a divisive issue. We all have the same interest in traveling on safe roads. But a national speed limit does not take into consideration regional differences of traffic volume and road conditions. This amendment would allow each individual State to decide whether or not to implement the increased speed limit without the fear of losing Federal funds. The mandatory 55-mile-per-hour limit currently proscribed by the Federal Government is achieved by restricting Federal highway funds to States who fail to comply. I believe it is an infringement upon States' rights to have such mandatory rules enforced by coercive tactics. For these reasons I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives will today turn back to the States a responsibility that is rightly theirs.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in support of this resolution to return to the States the right to determine the safest maximum speed limit their highways can accommodate. In the time I have available to me, I want to focus on this resolution's impact on highway safety, which appears to be the cornerstone of its opponents' arguments against its passage.

I am not going to debate the obvious fact that highway fatalities have been greatly reduced in the last 13 years. I do, however, take issue with those who claim that decreasing the speed limit is the sole contributor to our safer highways. Drunk drinking laws, improved

road repair, and cars equipped with a myriad of safety features, have all led to fewer people losing their lives on American highways.

This resolution does not apply to all highways, and it does not force States to raise the speed limit on all their rural interstates. It allows the speed limit to be raised only on rural interstate highways that the State determines to be safe enough for the enhanced speed limit. Rural interstate highways are in top repair, have high visibility, and carry very little traffic. In this country, no safer highways can be found.

There are other roads, however, that are equally safe. Rural four-lane highways need to be added to the list of roads that are eligible for the higher speed limit. Including these roads would permit States a greater degree of flexibility in deciding which highways can safely accommodate a 65-mile-per-hour speed limit.

My district, in particular, contains a number of rural four-lane highways which could easily accommodate a higher speed limit. Anyone who has driven the 150 miles between Lubbock and Odessa understands the lack of safety concerns that would be raised by increasing the speed limit on this stretch of rural four-lane highway.

We are all concerned about highway safety and no one wants to pass legislation that might provoke an increase in highway mortalities. It is ludicrous, however, for the Federal Government to mandate a single speed limit for the wide variety of highways traversing our country. Individual States are more than capable of determining the safest maximum speed their highways can accommodate, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for allowing States to raise the speed limit to a reasonable, safe speed. Let us stop usurping States' rights to the battle cry of "safety."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the national mandatory speed limit law of 1974 was enacted by Congress as a temporary measure to deal with the oil embargo. Driving at 55 miles per hour, it was thought, was the most efficient use of a car's engine. Back in 1974, "55" made sense. It no longer does.

The idea that the 55-mile per hour speed limit helps to conserve fuel has been talked about so frequently that many people hardly question it any more. However, the facts speak otherwise.

The Department of Transportation found that the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit, at best, reduced fuel consumption by 1 percent. That equals about \$350 million. On the other hand, the 55 speed limit costs the Nation about 1 billion man hours per year in extra driving. Even at the minimum wage of \$3.35 per hour, this amounts to \$3.35 billion. That's more than 10 times the amount of money saved going 55.

The facts also show that if tire pressure was increased in cars from 24 to 26 pounds, the same amount of fuel would be saved as driving at 55 miles per hour.

Today's cars are more fuel efficient than they were in 1974. There's an old saying: They sure don't make cars like they used to. I say thank goodness.

Further, these figures do not take into consideration the \$200 million spent by law en-

forcement officials who are required to make certain that 50 percent of the State's drivers don't exceed the mandatory speed limit.

When the fuel argument was shot full of holes, 55-mile-per-hour advocates looked for another angle to get motorists to accept the mandatory law. They went to the Department of Transportation for help.

When "55" became law, the statistics showed the traffic deaths dropped by 15.3 percent. Speed limit advocates found the angle they were looking for. Americans felt they were doing their patriotic duty to drive slower to conserve fuel, and saving lives was an added bonus.

But, the study conducted by the Department of Transportation was flawed. The claim that 55 saves lives is based on naive comparison of the 1973 fatality rate and the current rate. But comparing the 1967-73 rate with the 1974-83 rate shows that the rate of decline slowed after implementing 55. If 55 were saving lives, the rate of decline would have accelerated. Just the opposite occurred. In fact, had pre-1974 trends continued, the fatality rate in 1983 on all highways with speeds in excess of 55 miles per hour would have been lower except on urban interstates. Highway deaths have continued to decline since 1974, even though the average speeds have crept up.

So, if 55 has been given too much credit, what does save lives?

Our driving habits have changed. We are now into second generation drivers who have taken drivers' education. There are now fewer Sunday drivers on the road. Our cars are built better. We have better brakes, our tires last longer, and our cars are equipped with safety glass. Our roads are built better—especially our interstates, which were built to handle 70 miles per hour. Forty-two States plus the District of Columbia have increased the drinking age to 21. Twenty-four States plus the District have passed mandatory seat belt laws. And, more attention has been placed on drunk drivers, which account for over 50 percent of auto fatalities and injuries.

Personally, I would like to repeal the mandatory speed limit law and leave the issue up to each individual State. The Founding Fathers recognized the folly of giving the Federal Government the power to legislate on every topic—everywhere. Why should the Government saddle the sparsely populated areas of our country with a speed limit law that makes more sense in our heavily populated areas.

Mr. Speaker, I've tried to look at this issue from all sides. When I am back in my home State and I travel on the vast stretches of rural interstate, I think how ridiculous it is to impose a law that forces me to drive at 55. On the other hand, when I am back East, traveling on the Beltway, for example, I could literally wring the necks of those motorists who are driving 65 mph. "55" is needed in our heavily populated areas. The point is, there is a lot of variation. All I ask is that those of you who live in the East walk a mile in my shoes. Take a drive on I-80 from Salt Lake City to Nevada and see if you can keep your speedometer at 55 miles per hour.

I believe that much of our problem on this issue is that we fly just about everywhere we

go. We forget what it's like to live in the real world with our common man.

I'm reminded of the Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale of the emperor who bought an entire wardrobe of new invisible clothes. The idea was that only the wise and those who did their job well could see the clothes. The emperor's all-knowing advisors told him his new clothes were exquisite. You see, none of them wanted to face reality and appear foolish in the eyes of their emperor. But when the emperor went out into the streets, he was ridiculed by the common folks for not wearing any clothes.

We sit here in the Congress and blindly continue to claim that if the speed limit was raised on rural interstates, 400 to 1,000 lives would be lost. But, like the emperor, we are not living in the real world. People are driving 64 miles per hour on our interstates now, and traffic fatalities continue to drop. Rural interstates carry 19 percent of all travel on highways posted at 55 miles per hour, but account for only 9 percent of the fatalities on those roads, and only 4 percent of fatalities on all roads and highways.

My colleague from New Jersey, the chairman of the Public Works Committee, stated if those States that wanted to increase the speed limit would require safety measures, he would be flexible. Well, States are doing just that. As I indicated, States have increased their drinking age laws and have passed mandatory seat belt laws.

The Senate-passed amendment is a commonsense approach. It gives States the option of increasing speeds to 65 on rural interstates. As the national research council warned, "The law is nearing a breaking point and that action should be taken now to preserve its most effective parts before the law as a whole has been irreparably weakened by public criticism and widespread lack of compliance."

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCurdy].

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, last year the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Hansen] and I offered an amendment with a number of cosponsors to allow States to increase the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstate highways. That was the first time that the amendment had been offered on rural interstate highways. It was a permissive statute, a permissive piece of legislation that would allow the State to make the decision.

It was not mandatory; 198 of our colleagues voted for that amendment.

Today we vote on a slightly different amendment. Under the parliamentary procedure we are voting on an amendment that passed the Senate and was referred in conference to this body—passed overwhelmingly on the other side.

Today we have heard a lot of arguments. Members will argue, "Well, if you raise it to 65, then people are just going to drive 75." I think that that is a fallacious argument, because we need to enforce our laws. This law is not being enforced today. People are

not abiding by this. Why? Because they do not understand it; they do not respect it.

This is the 1980's equivalent of Prohibition. People did not respect it then; they do not respect it today.

Now we will hear the argument that we are going to save some 500 lives if this occurs. We are going to lose an additional 500 lives if we raise the speed limit. Since 1963 the facilities on Federal highways, on all highway systems, has been steadily declining. Since 1974 it has declined ever further, while at the same time the average speeds have increased.

Why have we had the savings? It is just 55? No; it is not. My State of Oklahoma now has a mandatory seat-belt law, child-restraint law, has tough enforcement on drunk driving, as do many States.

This is not just an issue that we in Washington are concerned about. People in legislatures throughout the country are concerned about this issue. We are not the only ones with the wisdom here. Let us let the States decide.

As I said earlier, this provision is permissive; it is not mandatory.

My colleagues argue fuel savings. Will it save an additional 100,000 barrels of oil a day? That might be true if we were driving 55, but we are not, the American public is not. The differential in savings is minuscule. In fact only 7 percent of the highway system would come under this provision—only 7 percent. The fuel savings is not the best argument.

It really does come down to the issue of who can best decide what is a safe speed on rural interstate highways. I would contend in my 8,000-square-mile congressional district that it is a little different from the chairman's district in New Jersey or a district in New York or Pennsylvania. I contend that the legislators in my district, the Governor, the National Governors Association, who support this legislation, know best.

Let us stop Prohibition in 1987.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first I would just like to reply to a few of the things that have been said here about some agencies that may be in favor, such as AAA, of increasing the speed limit. I would just like to give a brief rundown of a few of the organizations that are very strongly for keeping the speed limit as it is today: the American Medical Association; the International Association of Chiefs of Police; the American Insurance Association; Environmental Action; National Council of Senior Citizens; MADD—Mothers Against Drunk Driving; RID—Rid Intoxicated Drivers; the American Pedi-

atric Association; the Epilepsy Foundation—just to name a few of them.

First of all, let us get one thing clear. We have been throwing numbers around here. Let us be in the real world and know that whenever we say 55, in the real world we mean close to 65, because that is what the average is. And when the other people talk about going to 65, let us be in the real world and say close to 75, because that is what it will be, and that is what they intend if we should pass an increase in the speed limit.

You know, if you are in a crash at 55 miles an hour, the odds are even money that you are dead or you have killed anyone—any man, woman, or child—that you may hit. At 70 miles an hour the odds are 30 to 1 against you living and against any man, woman, or child that you may hit.

Here are some of the reasons that they say we should increase the present law. Remember, if I say 55 I really mean 65, just like they mean 75.

First of all, because a lot of the people do not observe the 55-mile limit, they say that that is a reason to eliminate it. People traditionally do not observe the 20-mile limit, the 40-mile limit, any limit you have, because of speedometers not being certain and the police radar. This is not a reason.

Then they say, "But the highways are designed for 70, and the cars are designed for 70." True. But we are not designed for 70. We do not control vehicles well at 70, and that is why we have so many of these single-vehicle accidents.

Of course the most important thing, because we are going to vote here in a few minutes, this is not the same vote that we cast last August. The vote on the McCurdy amendment to permit a temporary trial situation concerning the speed and safety designs for that highway and after 5 years to evaluate it had some safety features. This proposal has no safety features, no safety requirements. In fact, it does not even have the requirements that we presently have for 55 miles an hour in this amendment. They can all go a hundred miles an hour and there will not be any Federal requirements.

Now they say, "But you know, those States that are small populated, out West where you have the long roads, those are a lot safer."

Well, let us look at the figures. On rural interstates in this Nation, per hundred million vehicle-miles, the average death rate is 1.44. The highest fatality rate of any State on rural interstates, which is what we are voting on, is Nevada, with 4.55, over three times the national average. Second is Utah, third is Alaska, fourth is Arizona, fifth is Montana—certainly not our dangerous urban areas, but that is on rural interstates in rural States. That is because over half the



deaths on our rural interstates are not collisions, they are single-vehicle accidents, where the person loses control and goes off the road, hits somebody or something, and that is where you get the fatalities, single-vehicle.

The No. 1 cause is not drinking and driving, the No. 1 cause of that is speed. Second is drinking and driving. Next, a combination.

Now about the fact that the National Academy of Sciences said that they could not show anything. No, the Department of Transportation could not understand it, but in the study done by the National Academy of Sciences, if you look on page 11, projections indicate that this might result in about 500 more fatalities each year—flat out, in their statement.

We are talking about 500 on the rural interstate if we go up to this 75-mile-an-hour speed, and an additional 200 off the ramps or where you hit the urban interstate in the spillover effect. So you are talking about 700 a year—over the life of this bill, 3,500 deaths.

□ 1750

We have saved 90,000, 90,000 serious head injuries according to the Epilepsy Foundation, which is very, very concerned about this increase.

What we are trying to do and what we want to do in getting better compliance aimed at the fast drivers is to get the range down. That is very important. The range from the slowest drivers to the fastest is a big safety factor. If you raise that speed limit, the slower cars are not going to go any faster, but the ones who are now going fast will. If you have a big range, you are going to have a lot of passing, a lot of lane changing and a lot of deaths.

So what we ought to be doing, as we will be doing in legislation later this year, is aiming and targeting on the very fast drivers to get the range down so that we will be able to save lives from the fast to the slow.

Economics are involved. The American Trucking Association, a group that has an economic interest in this because they have to pay people to drive, and a lower speed limit costs them money because their drivers have to drive a longer time, but they more than make that up in fuel savings, in less maintenance and less insurance, and they are in favor of the 55-mile speed limit, even if the cars are allowed to go to 65.

Another very dangerous thing about this making it State by State, we have a national system here, the Interstate System we are talking about where the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the construction. We have people from all over, different States driving in other States. No one State has a State's right to endanger the lives of people from other States driving in their State.

We will have a lack of uniformity, a 65-mile limit here, maybe 55 in another State. That is going to cause a lot of trouble and a lot of danger.

I understand I have 1 minute remaining and I am going to use this 1 minute because I think it is symbolic. The present speed limit costs each of you, each person in this country 1 minute a day. That 1 minute, if you want to take that back, you are going to have to say by your vote so I can have that 1 minute back I am willing to have during the life of this bill, 5 years, 3,500 people killed. I am willing to have tens of thousands paralyzed, brain damaged. Do we want to do that and say we are willing to kill and maim all of those people so we can have 1 minute a day? I hope the answer is no, and I hope the vote on this resolution is "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. KILDEE). Pursuant to House Resolution 124, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 206, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—217

Alexander	Cheney	Gaydos
Archer	Clarke	Gekas
Armey	Coats	Gingrich
Aspin	Coble	Glickman
Atkins	Coleman (MO)	Gonzalez
Badham	Coleman (TX)	Gordon
Baker	Combest	Gradison
Ballenger	Craig	Grady
Barnard	Crane	Grant
Bartlett	Crockett	Gray (IL)
Barton	Dannemeyer	Gregg
Bateman	Darden	Gunderson
Bereuter	Daub	Hall (OH)
Bevill	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Bilbray	Davis (MI)	Hamilton
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Hansen
Bliley	DeFazio	Harris
Boner (TN)	DeLay	Hatcher
Bonker	Dickinson	Hayes (LA)
Boucher	DioGuardi	Hefley
Boulter	Dorgan (ND)	Henry
Brooks	Dornan (CA)	Henger
Broomfield	Dowdy	Hiler
Brown (CA)	Dreier	Holloway
Brown (CO)	Dubin	Hopkins
Bryant	Edwards (OK)	Horton
Buechner	Emerson	Houghton
Bunning	English	Hubbard
Burton	Erdreich	Huckaby
Bustamante	Espy	Hunter
Callahan	Fazio	Hutto
Campbell	Fields	Hyde
Carr	Foglietta	Inhofe
Chandler	Frank	Ireland
Chapman	Frenzel	Jeffords
Chappell	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)

Johnson (SD)	Myers	Skelton
Jones (TN)	Nagle	Slattery
Jontz	Neal	Smith (IA)
Kasich	Nichols	Smith (NE)
Kennedy	Nielson	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Ortiz	Smith, Denny
Konnyu	Owens (UT)	(OR)
Kyl	Oxley	Smith, Robert
Lagomarsino	Panetta	(NH)
Leath (TX)	Parris	Smith, Robert
Lehman (CA)	Pashayan	(OR)
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Solomon
Lewis (FL)	Pickett	Spence
Lightfoot	Pickle	Stallings
Livingston	Porter	Stenholm
Lloyd	Price (IL)	Stump
Lott	Ravenel	Sundquist
Lujan	Rhodes	Sweeney
Lukens, Donald	Richardson	Swift
Lungren	Ritter	Swindall
Mack	Roberts	Tallon
MacKay	Roemer	Tauke
Madigan	Rose	Thomas (CA)
Marlenee	Rostenkowski	Udall
Martin (NY)	Roth	Upton
McCloskey	Roybal	Vander Jagt
McCollum	Russo	Vucanovich
McCurdy	Saiki	Walker
McKinney	Schaefer	Watkins
McMillan (NC)	Schroeder	Weber
Meyers	Sensenbrenner	Weldon
Mica	Sharp	Whittaker
Michel	Shaw	Williams
Miller (OH)	Shumway	Wilson
Montgomery	Sikorski	Wyden
Moorhead	Sisisky	Young (AK)
Morrison (WA)	Skaggs	
Murphy	Skeen	

NAYS—206

Ackerman	Flippo	Matsui
Akaka	Florio	Mavroules
Anderson	Foley	Mazzoli
Andrews	Ford (MI)	McCandless
Annunzio	Ford (TN)	McDade
Anthony	Frost	McEwen
Applegate	Gallo	McGrath
AuCoin	Garcia	McHugh
Bates	Gejdenson	McMillen (MD)
Bennett	Gephardt	Mfume
Bentley	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Berman	Gilman	Miller (WA)
Biaggi	Goodling	Mineta
Boehlert	Gray (PA)	Moakley
Boggs	Green	Molinari
Boland	Guarini	Mollohan
Bonior (MI)	Hammerschmidt	Moody
Borski	Hastert	Morella
Bosco	Hawkins	Morrison (CT)
Boxer	Hayes (IL)	Mrazek
Brennan	Hefner	Murtha
Bruce	Hertel	Natcher
Byron	Hochbrueckner	Nelson
Cardin	Howard	Nowak
Carper	Hoyer	Oakar
Clay	Hughes	Oberstar
Clinger	Jacobs	Obey
Coelho	Jenkins	Olin
Conte	Jones (NC)	Owens (NY)
Conyers	Kanjorski	Packard
Cooper	Kaptur	Patterson
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Pease
Courter	Kennelly	Penny
Coyne	Kildee	Pepper
Dellums	Klecza	Perkins
Derrick	Kolter	Price (NC)
DeWine	Kostmayer	Pursell
Dicks	LaFalce	Quillen
Dingell	Lancaster	Rahall
Dixon	Lantos	Rangel
Donnelly	Latta	Ray
Downey	Leach (IA)	Regula
Duncan	Lehman (FL)	Ridge
Dwyer	Leland	Rinaldo
Dymally	Lent	Robinson
Dyson	Levin (MI)	Rodino
Early	Levine (CA)	Roe
Eckart	Lewis (GA)	Rogers
Edwards (CA)	Lipinski	Roukema
Evans	Lowry (WA)	Rowland (CT)
Fascell	Luken, Thomas	Rowland (GA)
Fawell	Manton	Sabo
Feighan	Markey	Savage
Fish	Martin (IL)	Sawyer
Flake	Martinez	Saxton

Scheuer	Staggers	Volkmer
Schneider	Stangeland	Walgren
Schuette	Stokes	Waxman
Schulze	Stratton	Wheat
Schumer	Studds	Whitten
Shuster	Synar	Wise
Slaughter (NY)	Taylor	Wolf
Slaughter (VA)	Thomas (GA)	Wolpe
Smith (FL)	Torres	Wortley
Smith (NJ)	Torricelli	Wyllie
Snowe	Towns	Yates
Solarz	Trafficant	Yatron
Spratt	Valentine	Young (FL)
St Germain	Visclosky	

## NOT VOTING—10

Beilenson	Lowery (CA)	Vento
Collins	Stark	Weiss
Daniel	Tauzin	
Kemp	Traxler	

□ 1810

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stark for, with Mr. Weiss against.  
Mr. Lowery of California for, with Mr. Beilenson against.

Mr. VOLKMER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GONZALEZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1516

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1516, the Tongass Timber Reform Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### HEMOCARE QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT OF 1987

(Mr. ROYBAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, to introduce the "Homecare Quality Assurance Act of 1987" [HCQA]. HCQA is an important first step for Congress in ensuring the quality of care received by all persons in their homes whether it is provided under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Security block grant, or the Older Americans Act.

The need for legislation became apparent in the findings of the American Bar Association's [ABA] study of home care quality, "The Black Box of Home Care Quality," which was released at the committee's hearing on this issue in July of last year. The ABA report outlines the disturbing lack of knowledge about the quality of care provided in the home setting, the alarming potential for quality problems, and the inadequacy of our current quality assurance system when it comes to care

provided in the home. The findings of their report make it clear that we need to improve consumer protections and develop standards and monitoring mechanisms which will ensure that home care services are reliable and of the highest quality possible.

Recent attention to the problem of catastrophic health care has also brought attention to the greater problem of the financial catastrophe of long-term care. As a result, the question of long-term care financing is back on the table in the context of needed short- and long-term health reforms. Most would agree that, when medically appropriate, home care services are the preferred vehicle for care and should be at the heart of any long-term care debate. Yet, it is critical that reforms that expand or liberalized coverage of home care also be accompanied by reforms that ensure the quality of care provided.

While home care services generally enjoy a good reputation, we are deeply concerned by the potential for quality problems in light of the rapid growth in home care services in recent years, the increased financial pressures on home care providers under cost containment, the absence of adequate Federal and State quality assurance systems for home care and the lack of training for home care personnel. Most importantly is the in-home location of services that makes the actual delivery of care virtually invisible and, therefore, largely beyond the easy reach of public or professional scrutiny.

"The Homecare Quality Assurance Act," for which I am asking your support, addresses the deficiencies in our current quality assurance system. The act covers all home care services provided under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Security block grant, and the Older Americans Act. Key provisions include: establishes a home care consumer bill of rights; creates State consumer boards; sets home care quality standards; creates quality assurance monitoring mechanisms through PRO's and the States; requires Federal survey of home care agencies; expands the State Ombudsman Program to include home care services; calls for a strong consumer role in monitoring activities; requires that agencies engage in care coordination; requires that sanctions and penalties be available to ensure compliance; provides for training all home care providers; and calls for research and demonstration projects and the collection of data on the use and quality of home care services.

Clearly, home care plays a vital role in permitting older persons to continue living independently or with their families in the community. Yet, providing care in the home carries the risk of poor care, unreliable services, and outright neglect, abuse and exploitation. It is therefore our challenge to work cooperatively and create a system to ensure that all care provided in the home is of the highest quality possible and delivered in the best interests of the consumer and their family.

The opportunities for action this year are many and immediate. First, HCQA provides a starting point for debate on a number of dimensions of the homecare quality issue—from consumer protection; to quality assurance standards, monitoring and enforcement; to research, training; to improving wages and benefits. Second, movement on nursing home

quality legislation is anticipated over the next few months that will include a discussion of nursing home aide training—an issue equally relevant to home health and homemaker aides. A third opportunity stems from the administration's interest in home care quality, as evident in the planned initiation of homecare quality demonstration projects and improvement of home health survey procedures. Finally, the reauthorization of the Older American's Act this year provides the opportunity to strengthen the role of the State ombudsman program to include advocacy on behalf of home care consumers as well as residents of nursing homes and board and care facilities.

I urge you to join me in supporting this legislation and demonstrating to the American public that congressional concern for quality care does not stop at the hospital or nursing home door—but extends into what is potentially the most vulnerable care environment of all, the home.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, the attached summary of the "Homecare Quality Assurance Act of 1987" for the RECORD.

#### THE HOMECARE QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT OF 1987 (HCQA)

A bill to establish a quality assurance system for homecare services

##### PURPOSE

"The Homecare Quality Assurance Act of 1987" (HCQA), is designed to promote the health, safety and well-being of individuals receiving health and social services in their homes under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Services Block Grant and the Older Americans Act by establishing: a Federal bill of rights for homecare consumers; "home health" and "home help" quality assurance standards; provider training standards; homecare quality assurance monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms; homecare quality assurance studies and demonstrations; state homecare ombudsman activities; State Consumer Boards; and a National Homecare Quality Assurance Council.

##### BACKGROUND

Growing Need.—With the rapid increase in the number of the elderly and the availability of funding to support services, homecare has mushroomed over the past two decades, but with virtually no provisions to ensure the quality of care delivered. While four percent of the population of United States was 65 or over in 1900, that age group is now 12 percent. In 1900, some three million persons were sixty-five and older compared to twenty-eight million in 1984. That number of older persons is expected to increase even more dramatically over the next several decades, reaching over sixty-four million by the year 2030. More importantly, the greatest percentage of growth is in the number of persons in the 85 and older category. While the rest of the population increased by 9.1 percent over the past ten years, the 85+ population grew by 56.6 percent. It is this group of individuals—an estimated 31.6 percent of those 85 years and over—who have the greatest need for homecare and other long term care services, as they are at the greatest risk of chronic illnesses and limitations in functional abilities.

Growing Pressures of Cost Containment.—The pressure of cost containment on homecare services is twofold. First, incentives for earlier hospital discharge under Medicare's prospective reimbursement system have resulted in people being re-



leased "sooner and sicker" and created a greater demand for post-hospital care. At the same time, cost containment measures on Medicare's already limited post-hospital benefit have made it even more difficult for beneficiaries to access the home and community-based care they need now more than ever. This presents a true "Catch 22" and raises serious quality concerns for beneficiaries in need of care and for providers who must operate in an increasingly lean and competitive marketplace.

**Rapid Growth in Services.**—Concurrently, there has been a rapid growth and expansion in the homecare market. Between 1966 and 1986, the number of certified home health agencies grew from 1,275 to 6,005. Since 1982, certified home health agencies have increased by 55 percent. Although home health care consumes only three percent of the Medicare budget, it is the fastest growing segment of that budget. From 1974-83, Medicare expenditures for home health increased at an annual rate of 25 percent. Investor-owned agencies increased by 300 percent between 1982 and 1984. Proprietary home health care agencies now make up more than 30 percent of Medicare certified agencies, up from six percent in 1979. In addition, there are many homecare agencies providing only support services or a mix of support and health services. While no accurate figure exists documenting the number of agencies or programs which provide these services, the American Bar Association estimates that they may number 10,000.

**Future Role of Homecare.**—Recent attention to the problem of inadequate protection against the costs of acute catastrophic care has also brought attention to the greater problem of the financial catastrophe of long term care. As a result, the question of long term care financing is back on the table in the context and long-term catastrophic care. Most would agree that, when medically appropriate, homecare services are the preferred vehicle for care and should be at the heart of any long term care debate. Yet, it is critical that reforms that expand the potential for homecare be accompanied as well by reforms that ensure the quality of care provided.

**Inadequacy of Current Quality Assurance System.**—Despite this dramatic growth in homecare, little is known about the quality of care provided. As such, homecare quality remains a "black box"—a virtual unknown. There is a lack of data about who is providing these services, how many people are being served and how many public and private dollars are going into homecare. Most importantly, little objective data is available on the quality of homecare. The data that do exist are primarily anecdotal and range from statements of "excellent services" to "horror stories." Of particular concern is the in-home location of services that makes the actual delivery of care virtually invisible and, therefore, largely beyond the easy reach of public or professional scrutiny.

Quality standards for homecare are, at best, inadequate. Further, what monitoring occurs at the federal level focuses largely on reimbursement fraud and abuse. Although Medicare conditions of participation provide standards for the delivery of home health care, these standards have been criticized as only providing "paper" compliance. Further, federal quality assurance standards and monitoring systems for home health services, i.e., homecare services other than home health services, are virtually nonexistent. The quality assurance standards and monitoring systems that are available for

home help services are provided by the states or local units of government. The American Bar Association reports that thirty-four states and the District of Columbia have some regulation of homecare. In the majority of these cases, regulations mimic the Medicare conditions of participation and focus on home health care rather than the broad array of homecare services.

**Lack of Training and Professional Esteem.**—Problems of training and professional recognition in homecare are most pronounced among the cadre of unlicensed workers whose primary role is in the provision of homemaker/home health aide, personal support, companion, and other health-related services. Unlike other health professionals, these providers typically receive little to no formal training and work at or below the minimum wage and without employee benefits. Under these conditions, the quality and reliability of homecare services can only suffer from limited opportunities for training, the lack of proficiency standards and the lack of professional regard. Low wages and lack of professional esteem also contribute to a frequently cited problem in homecare—the unreliability and rapid turnover of homecare aides. For persons dependent on home support, a pattern of "no shows" can make or break their continued care at home and, in some instances, be life threatening. At best, repeated changes in care providers compromises the continuity and quality of individual care.

#### THE BILL

"The Homecare Quality Assurance Act of 1987" (HCQA), is a first step toward ensuring the quality of care provided to persons in their home under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Services Block Grant, and the Older Americans Act. HCQA is based, in part, on the findings of a 1986 report released by the House Select Committee on Aging and prepared by the American Bar Association entitled, "The Black Box of Homecare Quality". This report points to the serious deficiencies of our current quality assurance system when it comes to homecare.

A synopsis of the Homecare Quality Assurance Act of 1987 (HCQA) appears below and is followed by a detailed description of bill provisions.

#### BILL SYNOPSIS

Establishes a federal bill of rights for homecare consumers under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Services Block Grant, and the Older Americans Act.

Sets "home health" and "home help" quality assurance standards and requires agency compliance as a condition of participation under Medicare, Medicaid, the Social Services Block Grant, and the Older Americans Act.

Requires that homecare agencies have plan of care policies that identify services to be provided, provide a means for identifying additional client needs and include coordination mechanisms with other service agencies.

Requires that PROs conduct quality assurance monitoring of all home health agencies funded under Medicare or Medicaid.

Requires that states have a quality assurance monitoring mechanism for home help services funded under the Social Services Block Grant Program, the Older Americans Act and the Medicaid Home and Community Based Services Waiver Program.

Amends the Older Americans Act to include and provide separate funding for

homecare ombudsman activities for the purpose of investigating and resolving homecare as well as nursing home and board and care complaints.

Requires federal survey of homecare agencies, with allowances for "deemed status" for agencies accredited by organizations or certified by states having standards at least as stringent as federal conditions of participation.

Encourages states to establish comparable quality standards and survey procedures for homecare agencies under State programs serving consumers of all ages.

Requires that states establish Consumer Boards which conduct oversight activities, provide input into the award and evaluation of the PRO and home help monitoring mechanisms, engage in consumer education, and receive input from homecare beneficiaries.

Requires that PROs, state homecare monitoring mechanisms and ombudsman programs have toll-free hot-lines to receive questions and complaints from beneficiaries, providers and others concerning homecare quality issues.

Requires that sanctions, including intermediate sanctions and civil penalties, be available to ensure compliance with quality assurance standards.

Requires that DHHS set minimum proficiency standards for all persons delivering homecare services and fund training programs for personnel and caregivers. Encourages states to develop licensing requirements for home health providers.

Requires that DHHS establish guidelines and provide funding for homecare training grants, for homecare demonstration projects, and for homecare quality assurance studies, including research on training and wage levels.

Requires that DHHS implement and administer all provisions of the Act in conjunction with a National Homecare Quality Assurance Council representing providers, consumers, states, accrediting bodies, fiscal intermediaries, PROs, researchers, and others.

**MARIA DE ANGELIS AND HE-  
LAINE SWEET, SPRINGFIELD,  
MA, SCHOOL VOLUNTEERS,  
"LEADERS OF READERS RE-  
COGNITION AWARDS"**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the Capitol, Secretary of Education William Bennett joined representatives of Family Circle magazine, and the Council of Periodical Distributors, in presenting the national "Leaders of Readers" recognition awards.

I am delighted and proud to inform the Members of the House, that two of my constituents, Maria De Angelis and Helaine Sweet, of the Springfield MA, school volunteers, were among the four grand award recipients honored at this mornings ceremony.

According to a 1984 book industry study, only 50 percent of Americans can be classified as "readers."

A distressing number of our citizens—27 million by recent estimates—

are functional illiterates, a figure that is expected to grow by 2.3 million persons annually.

We have all seen the public service media announcements, which underscore the fact that, "reading is fundamental."

And so it is.

Reading skills are fundamental to our national effort, to reverse the illiteracy statistics I just mentioned.

And a love of reading is fundamental, to experiencing the wonders contained in the great works of literature, that are an important part of our civilization.

The Federal Government will spend more than \$8 billion this year on elementary, secondary, and vocational education programs.

State and local governments will spend tens of millions of dollars more.

Much of this money will be directed toward efforts to teach skills, and encourage good reading habits.

Those efforts must continue, but more can, and should be done.

The Family Circle CPDA awards program, recognizes, that valuable initiatives in the battle against illiteracy are being developed on the local level.

These initiatives, and the dedication and commitment through which they were created, can be replicated in other cities and towns.

Encouraging this effort is the purposes of the "leaders of readers" program, and I believe it is an undertaking that deserves the commendation of this House.

Mr. Speaker, the Springfield School volunteers have a distinguished tradition of fostering community involvement in the education of our young people.

s program, supervised by Maria De Angelis and Helaine Sweet, is certainly in keeping with that tradition.

It blends, the natural enthusiasm of children, with two of their favorite rewards, ice cream and peer recognition, into a program that results in students eager to read more books.

The appreciation of reading that is produced is a gift, for a lifetime—a gift that will serve both the students and their communities well in the years to come.

I want to congratulate Ms. De Angelis and Ms. Sweet on their efforts, and the Friendly Ice Cream Corp., represented today in Washington by its corporate public affairs director Jim Velis, for its sponsorship of this program.

Friendly Ice Cream is one of western Massachusetts' finest corporate citizens and this is an example of why it is held in such high regard.

Joining our award winners in the capitol are Springfield Mayor Richard Neal and Springfield School Superintendent Thomas Donahoe.

Their presence is a testament to the fact that, in Springfield, education is both a civic commitment and a source of civic pride.

I want to welcome them all with the hope that the recognition being given to the friendly readers program encourages the realization that the important job of educating our children is not a responsibility of government alone, but should involve all of us.

#### EXPLANATION OF MISSED VOTES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I was in my 16th Congressional District on official business and unfortunately missed votes on H.R. 1085, a measure which would make the new GI bill permanent (rollcall 31), and H.R. 1157, the Farm Disaster Assistance Act of 1987 (rollcall 32). In light of the importance of H.R. 1085 to the veterans of my district, and the strong support of H.R. 1157 by the farmers in my district, I would have voted "aye" on both of these measures had I been present on the House floor to cast my vote.

#### PENSION SECURITY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an issue which strikes at the heart of working America—pension security. When LTV, Inc., filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy last July, the specter of corporate default on benefit obligations was raised. That nightmare became reality when LTV unilaterally terminated health and life insurance benefits for approximately 78,000 retirees nationwide. The implications of these actions have had enormous impact not only on the affected retirees but the American business community as well.

An immediate legislative response was required. Congressman STOKES rose to the challenge and introduced a bill, H.R. 5283, of which I was a cosponsor, seeking to compel LTV to honor its life and health insurance obligations. The substance of H.R. 5283 was adopted in the continuing resolution and was instrumental in extending the court-imposed deadline for continuation of benefit payments until May 15, 1987.

My own response was the introduction of H.R. 3838, a bill to provide money in the form of investment tax credit carrybacks amounting to approximately \$150 million. The funds were specifically to be applied to revitalization of existing steel facilities and the payment of health insurance benefits to its workers. This provision was adopted into the Tax Reform Act of 1986 in its entirety.

These legislative actions were essential in alleviating the initial crisis situation, but the time has come for permanent solutions to be

found and implemented. Congressman STOKES has once again answered the call and introduced legislation to permanently modify the Bankruptcy Code and insure that a unilateral termination of health and life insurance benefits does not happen again.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1186, The Retiree Benefits Security Act of 1987 and would like to commend Congressman STOKES and Senator METZENBAUM for taking the lead on this issue of vital concern to retirees and workers everywhere.

The problems of the steel industry continue to escalate however, and until an effective restructure of the industry occurs the fate of steelworkers everywhere will continue to hang in the balance. On January 13, 1987, the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corp. [PBGC] terminated and assumed LTV's pension plans. These plans were underfunded by approximately \$2.1 billion.

The termination of these plans have increased PBGC's operating deficit to an estimated \$4 billion. At this rate PBGC will only be able to survive another 10 years. Even more frightening is the fact that 10 out of 12 steel companies have underfunded pension plans. In short a disaster is waiting to happen unless action is taken very soon.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, I am greatly concerned with the growing crisis in the steel industry. It is obvious that the current structure cannot be maintained and I intend to hold hearings in an effort to address the problems and find viable solutions. If we are to come up with a comprehensive and workable agenda in which to rebuild the steel industry it is imperative that Congress, management and labor unite in a spirit of cooperation.

#### THE NEW WHITE HOUSE TAPES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most startling revelations of the Tower Commission was the documents found in the safe of Lt. Col. Oliver North. These documents suggested that tens of millions of dollars were provided to the Contras through a private network of corporations and non-profit organizations that the colonel helped to organize.

The flowchart of Project Democracy which may be connected to the National Endowment for Democracy, a group that we founded in this Congress, found in North's safe and reproduced in the Tower Commission report, will be central to current congressional and special prosecutor investigations.

The revelations of this investigation might make the Tower Commission report in the end read like Sesame Street. If the special prosecutor obtains access to National Security's Secure Telephone Units' taping of President Reagan, Vice President BUSH, Mr. McFarlane, Colonel North,



Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Regan, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Meese, we are back in the White House tape business all over again.

So I wanted to alert our colleagues to the fact that congressional investigators, as well as many senior members of the national security community, are unaware of the existence of these telephone tapes.

Staff and members of the Senate and House Intelligence Committees had not even heard of these tapes until recent date. It would be the equivalent of having the Nixon tapes, and it gives the potential for proving a case that might not otherwise be proved.

Bottom line: We should go slow on all the immunity requests that are pouring into the special committees that are investigating this.

#### A SALUTE TO THE KALMAR NYCKEL FOUNDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this body and the entire Nation the fine work being done by the Kalmar Nyckel Foundation, a small but dedicated group of Delawareans who have undertaken the building of a replica of the three-mast tall ship *Kalmar Nyckel* as part of the 350th anniversary of the first landing of Swedish settlers in America. The landing of the *Kalmar Nyckel* in 1638, at "the rocks" on the Christina River at what is now Wilmington, DE, marked the beginning of what has been a long and fruitful relationship between our two peoples. Many Americans of Swedish ancestry can trace their family roots to these early settlers, and the bond between the United States and Sweden is strengthened by the centuries-old kinship between Swedish-Americans and their European cousins.

In 1988, the State of Delaware will celebrate the trisusquicentennial of the first landing, and the *Kalmar Nyckel*, a 91-foot 17th century armed Dutch pinnace, will be a highlight of the festivities. The anniversary celebration will be attended by the King and Queen of Sweden and other dignitaries from the United States and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this challenging project has already gained international attention, and enthusiasm is growing rapidly. To build the ship, the Kalmar Nyckel Foundation will need to raise \$1.8 million. A "pledge-a-plank" campaign is well underway in its goal to raise these funds from interested businesses, community organizations, and individuals by the end of 1987.

Internationally recognized naval architect, Thomas Gillmer, an authority on 17th century ships and a former professor of naval architecture at the U.S. Naval Academy, is the ship's designer.

I commend the outstanding work of the Kalmar Nyckel Foundation, its president, Francis I. DuPont, the chairman of its advisory committee, Malcolm Mackenzie, its trustees, and the many volunteers who make the project possible.

Members of the board of trustees include: Capt. Daniel B. Charter, USCG, retired; James H. Gilliam, Sr., director of the New Castle County, DE, Department of Community Development and Housing; Herbert H. Gullberg, CEO, H. H. Gullberg, Inc., and former Governor of the Swedish Colony Society; H. Hunter Lott III, executive vice-president of Gilpin Allegheny Realty; Rev. Quintin E. Primo, former interim bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Delaware; John S. Reese IV, founding trustee of Holy Trinity "Old Swedes" Church Foundation; Calvin P. Stidham, owner, Stidham Boat Works of Odessa, DE; and Olof G. Sundin, president, Sundin's Fabriker A.B., Hudiksvall, Sweden, and past president of the Delaware Swedish Colonial Society.

The following are honorary trustees: Hon. J. Caleb Boggs, former Senator and Governor of the State of Delaware; John A. Munroe, Ph.D., Nathaniel C. Wyeth, and John E. Babiarz, former mayor of Wilmington, DE.

The 16-member advisory committee, chaired by Malcolm Mackenzie includes: Donald Callender, public relations and archeology; Lt. Col. Richard E. Kyle, USAF, retired, Armed Services; Dr. William B. Keene, Delaware School superintendent, education; Charles Jordan, advertising special ties; Hon. William McLaughlin, former mayor of Wilmington, government; Walter Moulder, president, Delaware Boating Council; Frederick Rohm, president, New Castle County Chamber of Commerce, business; William Swayze, groups; Donald Van Sciver, schools; Rita Beulie, community; Tina Lassen, membership; Ron Lamar, media; Barbara Swayze, descendants; Gunter Sunkler, products; C.A. Weslager, historical; and Loretta Kelly, secretary.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order precede other special orders entered into today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### A DEMOCRATIC PRESCRIPTION FOR FISCAL DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic majority of the House Budget Committee has become so frustrated with trying to meet its responsibilities that it is willing to abdicate those responsibilities and instead engage in a political ploy.

Unfortunately, this ploy, if actually adopted in a budget resolution, would be a prescription for fiscal disaster for many needed programs like Social Security, Medicare, defense, education and law enforcement and so forth.

Instead of offering the customary chairman's mark as a working document from which a final responsible budget resolution can be developed, the Democrat majority is proposing that we start from a total freeze of all outlays for fiscal year 1988 at their fiscal year 1987 levels.

In other words, all Federal programs would be frozen regardless of merit. This would amount to a super sequester.

This is one way, apparently, that the Democrat leaders hope to vent their wrath at President Reagan, who has been steadily resisting Democrat proposals to undo the tax reform package and raise income taxes to finance Democrat spending plans.

In effect, the Democrats say, "If the President will not agree to raise taxes, then we will show him. We will freeze everything." They also hope to drag the White House and Republican minority on the Budget Committee into a position where they might agree to a tax hike to rescue programs like Social Security, Medicare, education and the rest.

Frankly, it is a shameless and heartless ploy, and I do not believe it will work.

Democrats must know what a total outlay freeze would mean in fiscal year 1988. It would mean that between 36 and 37 million Social Security recipients would not only be denied a cost-of-living increase next January, but would receive a 2-percent cut in the present level of their checks if new retirees are to be paid. The cut now lays Social Security below the other amount estimated by the Congressional Budget Office as needed to cover a 4-percent cost-of-living increase and to maintain current service levels would total almost 6 percent.

Many of these older people are already existing on a very tight budget. This working document, so to speak, would put an unmerciful squeeze on them.

□ 1830

Medicare would suffer an 11.5 percent cut in the level needed to maintain current benefits. Again imagine the suffering this would cause among the Nation's senior citizens.

There would be a cut of almost 4 percent in defense outlays. In order to reach this level, we would have to reduce defense budget authority by 8 percent. All this would be in addition to the 6-percent real cut in defense which has taken place over the past 2 years. Thousands of military personnel would have to be laid off, and our world readiness to fend off aggression would suffer greatly. Perhaps most importantly, the Soviets would interpret such a cutback in national defense as a sign of American weakness and react accordingly in arms control negotiations.

Here are some of the other cuts in outlays from current services levels that the various major governmental functions would have to take:

International Affairs, Function 150, would take a \$3 billion cut, or a 17.86-percent reduction.

Function 250, General Science, Space and Technology, would suffer a \$1.2 billion reduction, or 11.21 percent.

Energy would suffer a \$1.7 billion reduction, or 31.48 percent.

Natural Resources and Environment would suffer a \$1.7 billion cut, or a 10.97-percent reduction.

Agriculture, incidentally, would be increased by \$0.2 billion, or 0.67 percent.

Commerce and Housing would be increased by a half billion dollars, or a 6-percent increase.

Transportation would be reduced by \$3.3 billion, or an 1.5-percent reduction.

Community and Regional Development would be increased by \$0.7 billion, or 10.29 percent.

Education, Training, Employment and Social Services would be decreased by \$2.3 billion, or 7.06 percent.

Health would be reduced by \$3.8 billion, or 8.62 percent.

Medicare, as I mentioned, would be reduced by \$9.4 billion, or 11.31 percent.

The Income Security section would be reduced by \$7.2 billion, or 5.48 percent.

Veterans' Benefits and Services would be reduced by \$1.2 billion, or 4.38 percent.

The Administration of Justice would be reduced by \$1.1 billion, or 12.09 percent.

General Government would be reduced by \$300 million, or 4.35 percent.

General Purpose Fiscal Assistance would be reduced by \$200 million or 10.53 percent.

Net Interest would be reduced by \$6.8 billion, or 4.84 percent.

The Allowance section would be reduced by \$500 million, or 55.56 percent.

Offsetting Receipts would be increased by \$5.42 billion, or 12.87 percent.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I was just curious about this. The document the gentleman is referring to there, is that the finally awaited for Democratic budget proposal or the House proposal?

Mr. LATTA. Well, that is the proposal that I understand we are going to be asked to mark up from tomorrow. That is the 1987 budget without any increases whatsoever.

Mr. MACK. Again let me ask, have they put together a budget? I guess that is what I am trying to ask.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that I do not think they have put together a budget. I do not think they have been able to do that. I think they have been frustrated. They have been running around over the country condemning the President's budget and saying, "You can't do this" and "You can't do that" for the last 2 months.

Now it is their time to put up or shut up, and they are coming up with this proposal for the 1987 budget, which is what we are supposed to mark up from.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean this is the same group that has been talking about the lack of leadership on the budget issue, this same group that has been day after day and week after week, as the gentleman indicated, traveling around the country beating up on the budget the President submitted? They have not come to you with a budget proposal yet? Do I understand this is just some kind of a fictitious document?

I just do not understand this. Where is the courage that we heard so much about in the past?

Mr. LATTA. I have not seen it.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order.

There has been much talk of late about the desirability of a budget summit bringing together the White House and the Congress, Republicans and Democrats, to deal with the most critical issue of how to reduce the deficit and move toward a balanced budget. It should be obvious to all observers that there is nothing to negotiate at such a summit until both sides have put their plans on the table.

From the Democrats who control both Houses of the Congress all we

hear are complaints about the President's budget. That is all well and good. But the time for fun and games is over. It is about time we hear not what the Democrats are against but what they are for.

The Democrats argue that the President's budget does not hit the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target of \$108 billion, but that the White House budget is closer to a \$135 billion deficit. But the Democrats, in their zeal to be critical rather than constructive, not only have not come up with a budget to hit \$108 billion, but they have not even come up with one to hit a \$135 billion deficit.

The time for political posturing is over. I say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle: the ball is in your court. Do you really want a budget summit? And, if so, instead of telling us what you are against, how about telling us what you are for.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate his taking this time to allow us the chance to point out that the Democrat majority has failed for the first time to submit a budget proposal, and the markup is scheduled for tomorrow.

We are going in the markup at 9:30 tomorrow morning, Thursday morning, and here it is, 6:30 the night before. We have not been given any document from which to mark up a trillion-dollar budget with thousands of line items, and we have no promise of any document with which to begin our work to try to solve America's deficit problem, which leads to the loss of jobs because the trade deficit can be directly attributed to the Federal spending and the Federal borrowing to make up the deficit which we saw last year and continue to see.

What are the Democrats coming forward with? Well, first they tell us that we are going to start with a freeze of the outlays at the 1987 level. I will talk about that in a minute. Then they come forward and tell the press, according to a story in today's New York Times, that they are working on proposals aimed at reducing the projected 1988 deficit by \$36 billion, half of it through tax increases and then the other half through cuts in discretionary spending, cuts on the national defense and the other on social spending.

So what is their proposal? They are speaking to us in tongues, I suggest. It is unintelligible. There is no leadership on the Democrat side. Last fall the Democratic Party went around this country—and they have been going around since, like the Speaker



and the chairman of the Budget Committee and others—and saying, "Give us, the Democrats, a chance to lead this Nation. We will show you that we have got a clear and resounding trumpet calling the Nation to sacrifice and calling for solutions to our basic problems." And what is the tinkling symbol that we get when they get the chance to lead?

I would point out to the gentleman and to everyone else listening that the Democrats control the House by a hefty majority and now they control the other body, the U.S. Senate. They control both bodies of the Congress. They asked for leadership last year; the American people gave it to them. The American people said, "Solve this trade deficit. Solve the budget deficit. Solve the budgetary problems that America faces."

What is their answer? I say to the Members that they are speaking in tongues.

□ 1840

What would the outlay freeze do if that is the route that they go? If they freeze outlays based on the 1987 level, let us talk about it half-a-minute here.

If this is what they are talking about as leadership, we shall all be scared of their stewardship. An outlay freeze would do this: It would gut America's defense by over \$45 billion in budget authority. That is assuming you do not hurt vital readiness accounts. But the majority proposal is a true freeze. That means the readiness accounts as well. That is an overall budget authority cut of \$28 billion, but over half would come from readiness accounts because of the way the Defense budget operates.

It would freeze interest on the debt. How can you freeze paying your interest? You can simply decline to pay the interest on the debts you have been forced to accrue over the years. Well, we just join some of our Latin American friends and tell the banks and those we owe money to we are not going to pay up. That is what this freeze would do unless you make some change in it. That is the kind of tinkling symbol and tongues that is coming out of the Democrat majority.

Social Security; Federal retirees; black lung beneficiaries and so on and so forth. Will we cut out their COLA's or even cut into the accounts they now receive? That is what the Democrats outlay freeze will get you to unless you make some changes. That is the leadership's answer, the majority's answer to a serious problem in this Nation.

Welfare and Medicaid; and outlay freeze on these means changing the laws to restrict the number of beneficiaries or cut the beneficiaries per person. That is what the Democrats are proposing in this outlay freeze based on 1987 outlays.

That is one side of their mouth. Out of the other side of their mouth they say to the press, we are working on a proposal to reduce the deficit by \$36 billion. That means abandoning Gramm-Rudman-Hollings that the Congress and the American people demanded last year to get us on the path toward a balanced budget by 1991. That Gramm-Rudman requirement is that we cut spending by upward of \$62 billion. The Democrats telling the press we are going to cut it by \$36 billion means they are abandoning Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. LATTA. They are not only abandoning it, they would be in violation of the law. The law is that you come down to those targets. Is that not correct?

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman is correct. The law is that we must come down by \$62 billion and they are telling the press we are going to violate the law. Second, it means that they are going to have to raise taxes and even the leadership of the House on the majority side has been floating all sorts of tax increase proposals over the last 2 or 3 months. Tax this, tax that, give us more money to spend. Tax and spend; tax and spend. That is the message we are getting these days. The same old tired message the American people threw out in 1980 and in 1984.

The other part of the proposal given to the newspapers is we are going to abandon Gramm-Rudman, we are going to raise taxes, and we are going to cut defense and entitlement programs or discretionary spending by upward of \$9 billion. That is what the other side of the tongue is saying on the leadership side.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that decisions are being avoided now at a time for decision. As the chairman pointed out, the leadership of the Democrat Party is willing to ignore the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings ceiling of \$108 billion. I think your point is very clear.

When you and I came to the Congress in 1981, the outlays were \$688 billion, and you and I are not surprised but they are going to be a trillion and 15 this year. We have not seen any leadership out of the Democrat chairman as to what he is going to do about this. I just commend the gentleman on his statement.

I, for one, want to stick with that \$108 billion target and I am sure that the gentleman does also.

Mr. ROGERS. Absolutely. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. The gentleman mentioned that there was an article today and I think it is interesting to point out that the New York Times said that it is an effort to blame Republicans and the President for their problems. You also mentioned that leadership is lacking. It looks to me like they are trying to substitute blame for leadership.

Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. ROGERS. Absolutely. I would agree with that; I think the gentleman is exactly correct.

The job of the chairman of the Budget Committee and the majority party, and let us point out that we are 2-to-1 outnumbered on the Budget Committee. The majority can vote in any proposal they want, whether we participate or not. Now, they came to us 2 or 3 days, working days, before markup was to commence, and said, "Hey, come on in and let us discuss the budget." A trillion-dollar budget in 2 or 3 days after they had been meeting privately for a month or 6 weeks. No time. Even yet we have not been given any proposal. What is it you are going to talk about so we can retire to our Chambers and discover what it is that you have in mind. They are yet to produce any kind of proposal except speaking in tongues either to the newspaper or to us with a different story.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I think the gentleman brought out a good point. You know, we do not have control of the process and when you look at the overwhelming majority that the Democrat leadership, Chairman GRAY, enjoys, and what he does with that. He only calls on the Republicans when it is to his advantage to try and put something out that looks like he is trying to be bipartisan. At no time does he really, truly want to be bipartisan.

I think if I recall correctly that you had a conversation with him you were telling me about earlier and about he wanted to be bipartisan. But you knew right away, as we have learned in years past, that when he says he wants to be bipartisan it means that he really is getting us set up, kind of like Linus and the football trick in "Peanuts."

I just wondered if you would expand on that little bit because I think it is really important.

Mr. ROGERS. The point I wanted to make was that the Democrat Party went to the American people last year and said give us a chance to leave. We will solve the deficit problem. We will

solve the trade deficit problem. Give us a chance, put us in power. The American people did. They put them in charge of the U.S. Senate and they put them in charge of the Congress; both Houses.

Now, when it comes time to put up or shut up on solving the problems, they shut up. We hear nothing out of them on what it is their proposal is to solve the problems they were given the responsibility to solve. Let us face it: Leadership in this nation is desperately needed on the Hill. We have got a great President, and we have got an administration, an executive branch that it moving. We have got a Congress that will not move to solve these basic problems.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Americans really need to understand that we are talking about the budget and we quote dollar amounts in various categories for various functions, but really, a budget is a political document because it states for all when you construct a budget where your priorities are. Where you put the dollars or where you put your emphasis in terms of what is important in this country.

The President has done that and that is his constitutional duty. What we are saying I think, people need to understand, that since Democrats both the House and the Senate and the House is the constitutionally charged body with putting together the dollars and cents, we have to pass that budget first, that since the Democrats control the House, we are asking them to put together their sense of the way the country ought to go. Their idea of what the budget ought to be. It is a political document. Politics is who gets what, when and how.

The Democrats want it both ways. They want to majority, they want to be able to control but they do not want to carry out the responsibility that that majority carries with it. That is to simply tell people where they stand on their priorities.

Mr. ROGERS. As President Harry Truman said,

A leader has to lead or otherwise he has no business in politics.

This leadership party is not leading. It is not giving a clear and resounding sound to the American people. With that, I am going to relinquish the balance of my time so that others may speak, but I am not prone to quote the Bible, but I am going to quote a portion of the Bible that I think is exactly relevant to what we are talking about here today, at least me. I am going to quote from Paul's statement in 1, Corinthians, chapter 14, where he said:

Now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues, how shall I benefit you unless I bring you some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching? If even lifeless instruments, such as the flute or harp, do not give distinct notes, how will any one know what is played? And if the bugle gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for battle?

So with yourselves; if you in a tongue utter speech that is not intelligible, how will any one know what is said? For you will be speaking into the air.

□ 1850

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUNDQUIST].

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished vice chairman for taking these special orders and for yielding me this time. I appreciate this opportunity to share a couple observations on this year's budget debate.

As a new member of the committee, I have watched with interest the political posturing of the Democratic leadership. For almost 2 months we were consumed in a prolonged attack on the President and the President's budget, including several committee meetings around the country where the focus was on attacking line by line what the President has proposed in his budget.

Now, he met the constitutional requirements in that budget. The budget was submitted on time. I do not agree with everything that is in the President's budget, but nevertheless he fulfilled his responsibility as a leader.

Last week after more than a week of apparently unsuccessful efforts to draft a Democratic budget plan, we budget Republicans were asked to join them in a bipartisan effort. Rather than taking the expedient route and refusing to cooperate, we Republicans asked for an opportunity to discuss this strategy with our leadership.

Yesterday at the same time we were meeting with our leadership to consider the challenge of joining together to produce a bipartisan budget, the Democrat leadership and the chairman of the Budget Committee announced to the press plans for a new strategy to discredit President Reagan's budget. That plan, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] said yesterday, is a clear admission that the Democrats have been unable to come up with a budget that they are proud to present to the American people. Embarrassed by their inability to produce a responsible document that cuts the deficit, it appears now the idea is to try to spread the embarrassment to the budget Republicans.

The deadline for the budget resolution is upon us and yet the House Democrat leadership remains paralyzed in facing up to their responsibilities to produce a budget document.

As the gentleman from Kentucky said earlier, when will the party that

says they are governing begin to govern?

Because of this institutional paralysis in this Chamber, tomorrow we are going to be faced with a Democrat proposal that would deny between 36 million and 37 million Social Security recipients their cost-of-living raise. In fact, an outlay freeze would actually reduce the Social Security benefits of many beneficiaries.

Because of the lack of political will, the Democrat leadership is abandoning the tradition of working from a chairman's mark in open session. Because of a case of political butterflies, we are going to be working from a document that the chairman himself says clearly is unacceptable in its implications.

So the exercise in political posturing only delays the inevitable. Sooner or later the majority leadership of this House must realize that its responsibilities in devising a budget extend further than merely throwing rhetorical bombs at the administration.

Did it have to come to this? No, I do not think it did, because last week we were asked to be bipartisan and join the process. Today we read in the papers how the markup tomorrow is designed to embarrass the President and House Republicans.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, a first term both in the Congress and in that committee, as is the gentleman from Tennessee. Last Thursday I think the consensus that we came away with was that there was a genuine intent by all the parties there, Republicans and Democrats, to try to reach some sort of a true bipartisan budget that is good for this country. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I would agree.

Mr. BUECHNER. And then all of a sudden I guess the old song, I heard it on the grapevine, the way we found out that the proposition had been taken off the table and literally what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] had been speaking of that we were reading about in the newspaper instead of having another meeting where we could discuss other options; is that correct?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. That is correct.

Mr. BUECHNER. So the leadership, I think the gentleman is talking about, was the leadership that it seemed at one point in time that we all were trying to aim toward what is right for this country and that is a balanced budget, but that committee for one brief moment seemed to be heading that way and then sort of like a 100-mile-an-hour train it crashed through



the brick wall into the cold cruel reality of politics.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. This is my second term on the Budget Committee and I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] would agree that last year we had three real meetings of the Budget Committee. We had some hearings around the country and some other hearings here in Washington, DC, but we had one when we organized the committee, one the day that they shoved their budget through over our objections, since we do not have very many members on the committee in comparison to our numbers in the body, and the third was when we got our picture taken. The good news was that we got a good picture.

The problem we enjoy or that we do not enjoy here is any kind of a bipartisan spirit to try to get at, first, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings goal of a \$108 billion deficit; and second, working for the best interests of the country.

Really, when it is to the advantage of the majority party in this body, the Democrats in this House under the leadership of Speaker WRIGHT, as it was under former Speaker O'Neill, they bring us in when it is to their advantage to try to look like they are bipartisan, but just as last year, we had 1 day of true activity on the budget and, bingo, it went through over our objections. I think the other members of the committee that were there were as outraged as I was over that kind of treatment; but the gentleman makes some good points on what this proposed markup will be tomorrow. We will have to wait and see, but we are still waiting for the supposed leadership of Chairman GRAY and the Speaker of this House to come forward to really try to do what is right for the American people in this budget.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Ohio yields any further, I would just like to make a couple more points that the gentleman has brought out, that for us to join this process, and we want a balanced budget, that is our goal, we only ask for some very reasonable things, to put the sequestration trigger back in Gramm-Rudman, because both parties voted for Gramm-Rudman in its enforcement mechanism 2 years ago.

We ask for an assurance of an effective reconciliation in this bill.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the sequestration means what, what is

that going to do for the American taxpayer and for the American public? What happened at the Supreme Court?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Well, it was a technicality, as the gentleman knows. We need to put some enforcement mechanism in so that if we do not do our job in the Congress, that the budget then is balanced, like reducing all spending.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Put the hammer back into the law that was passed?

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Yes; absolutely, put the hammer back in, so if we fall in our decisionmaking progress, then it is done arbitrarily. Now, we do not want that to happen, but there has to be an alternative.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. If we do not have that hammer, basically the Congress does not have the corporate courage to come forward and do what is right.

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I think that is a fair statement, at least the majority do not have that corporate courage.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to comment on the subject the gentleman has discussed, that is, the recent workings of the current Budget Committee. I think it is very important that Members understand and that the public understands that we all view the situation as such a serious situation, the deficit as so threatening to this Nation's future, both in terms of the strength of the economy and the trade deficit, that we were together last week in closed meetings for a frank discussion and in the course of that discussion one of our colleagues on the other side said that if we cannot get together, this Nation is going to see not just smoke and mirrors, but a majestic sham, a budget that is a majestic sham. On my time I hope to give some insight into the kinds of budgets we have seen so that we can put new meaning behind those words "majestic sham," but I think it ought to be recognized that we were all there speaking frankly because we heard what Rudy Penner, the head of the Congressional Budget Office, said to us. He said,

I don't care what you do about trade laws. I don't care how much you level the playing field. I don't care what you do about currency. If you don't reduce the deficit, you are not going to save jobs that are being destroyed through the trade imbalance. If you don't reduce the deficit, this Nation has no future in terms of the strength of our domestic economy or our position in the international market.

So we were all there last week because we wanted to make a difference. We came out of that meeting with a certain agreement as to what was

going to happen and when the press conference was held this morning it circumvented all those things that had been said and all that process that had been put in place and it said once more we are only interested in working together if it will promote the sham operation that we have been the sponsors of in the last couple years.

I yield back because on my time I will go into that in more detail, but I thank the gentleman.

□ 1900

Mr. SUNDQUIST. I thank the gentleman for making that point, that if there is a sham this year, it will be because the majority in this House refuses to face the serious problems in this country.

Two other quick points that I think would make sense to the American people that ought to be built into this budget process. One is an assurance of an effective reconciliation; we do not want to have another omnibus appropriations bill, and we do not want to have a breakdown in the budget process. Last, we need to be given a copy of the Democratic draft. By anybody's estimation, that is only playing fair. The President's budget has been out on the table, and now it is time for this House's legislative proposal.

So these are our concerns, and I consider myself to be among the mainstream among Republicans on the Budget Committee, and I do not endorse everything in the President's budget. At the same time, I do not condemn everything that the Democrats have proposed.

Last week we were asked to participate in the process, yet before we could respond, the chairman apparently decided to engage us in a game of political chicken at the expense of the country.

The Democrats have a majority, as the gentleman from Kentucky said, in both Houses of Congress. Their attacks on the President and on House Republicans may be successful in drawing attention away from their own inability to present a budget, but those efforts do not allow them to escape the obligation to govern.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to join our colleagues in discussing the budget and the dilemma we now face in the House because of the Democratic leadership's policies—or should I say nonpolicies?—on the budget.

The first thing that should be said about the budget process is that it is not bipartisan. It has been and remains a wholly owned and operated subsidiary of the Democratic leadership from the beginning.

If they had put a sign on the Budget Committee hearing room saying "Republicans Not Wanted" they could not have more strongly conveyed the impression of one-party rule that has marked their deliberations.

Yes; we read in the newspaper this morning that the Democrats have adopted a new strategy.

This "new tactic" as the Wall Street Journal put it, would involve public sessions, in addition to private ones, to craft a budget plan.

When I see the Democratic leadership saying it is trying a new tactic on the budget, I am reminded of those products we see advertised on television telling us they are new and improved.

I often wonder what that says about the product they have been selling us before this alleged new improvement. Are we to believe the previous product wasn't all that good? If so, why was it sold in the first place? And why should we believe these claims about improvement?

So I guess this new tactic on the part of the Democratic leadership must be seen as yet another step in the process of their obstruction, political timidity, and economic irresponsibility which isn't changed by the labels new and improved.

In 1981 and 1982, we Republicans forced our way into the process over the strenuous objection of then Speaker O'Neill.

But ordinarily Republicans are cut out of the budget process because the Democratic leadership sees that process, as they see so much else that goes on around here, as part of the divine right of the majority to rule.

For years I have been saying that both in theory and in practice the budget process has been such a failure, sometimes degenerating into farce, that it might be wise to consider its abandonment for the purposes of good government.

Here we have the Democratic majority complaining about what they call Reagan deficits and the Reagan budget. But under the budget process the ultimate power of the budget resides in the Congress. And in the House that means with the Speaker.

I for one believe the deficits have complex sources. But if the Democratic majority wishes to assign blame, they should look into their own budgets, their own appropriations and authorizations, their own priorities, their own spending and even their own taxation. Not one dime has been spent, not one tax has been levied in the last 30 years without the full participation and concurrence of the vast Democratic majority in this House of Representatives. What this Government has done to the American economy, good or bad, has in fact been done by the Congress, the legislative branch.

It is fitting that we discuss this during the bicentennial year of the Constitution because that great document places authority for spending and for raising taxes in the legislative branch.

Since that branch has been in control of one party for 50 years, with some minor interruptions, one would think that party would be held accountable for budget crises.

But in an escape act worthy of Harry Houdini, the Democratic House majority attempts to wriggle out of the responsibility and place the blame on someone else. This may be good vaudeville but it is not good government.

Let's look at the current situation.

First, the Democrats refuse to write a budget.

They have the power and they have the responsibility. But the Democrats simply refuse to do what they have demanded to have the right to do.

Second, they want to abandon Gramm-Rudman without even an effort to meet its goals. I do not know where this shows a lack of understanding or lack of ability, but the fact is that Gramm-Rudman is not being confronted realistically by the Democrats.

Third, and perhaps most important, they want to raise taxes.

This is nothing new. There is, I believe, something in the genetic code of every Democratic leader that calls for higher taxes. It might be called the Mondale gene.

But in this case, the call is stranger than usual. We hear about oil import fees that might be fine for some sections of the country—Texas might be one example—but not good for others, like my own.

Then we hear about the latest so-called soak-the-rich idea which is to tax stock transactions. Sure it has that old demagogic ring to it. But the fact is that a lot of people on pensions who have their money in big mutual funds will get hurt.

There would be a drastic loss of equity for pensioners under such a plan. But the Democrats proceed, as they always do, with a kind of magnificent arrogance, doing a tapdance on the hopes and dreams of millions of working people while whistling the same old tune of taxing the big guys.

And now we have the latest episode in the Democratic leadership's flight from reality—and realistically—on the budget.

They seek to tie the Iran-Contra affair to the budget crisis.

Wait a minute, you might say—what does one case have to do with the other?

Well, the answer, of course, is nothing. But consistency has never been one of the virtues we expect for those engaged in partisan sniping. So we are seeing little jokes being made by

Democratic leaders, using the Iran-Contra controversy.

The Associated Press said recently that even the Speaker had—and I quote—adopted, "his party's rhetoric in the Iran-Contra affair" to attack the President on the budget.

In the immortal words of Everett Dirksen: "Ha-ha \* \* \* not to mention ho-ho."

Well, that's just about what we have come to expect.

The Democratic leadership, lacking a policy of its own, but unwilling to accept the leadership of the Republicans, takes refuge in one liners. We ask them for Thomas Jefferson and they give us Henny Youngman.

I have always thought the Democratic leadership was funny enough about the budget without having them resorting to wisecracks.

But in the classic method of blaming the victim, those who do not have the courage and lack the wisdom to solve the budget crisis are now blaming the President.

This special order is a good time to remind the Democratic leadership that they wanted the budget process and they have the majority in both Houses and they, constitutionally, are expected to get up off their one liners and blaming-the-victim routines and start doing something.

During the past 2 months, we have heard repeated criticisms from the chairman of the Budget Committee and others regarding the President's budget and its economic and technical assumptions, which some claim have underestimated the budget deficit.

All this is hypothetical, of course. In many instances the administration and the Congressional Budget Office are trying to project the future. It may be well to give both the benefit of the doubt.

What is not in doubt, however, is that this January's economic forecast is better than last spring's, particularly in determining accurate estimates for fiscal year 1987.

Yet, curiously, the chairman of the Budget Committee has strayed from past practices. He has submitted to the House a budget status scorekeeping report, the so-called current-level report required by the Budget Act. But it is based on the grossly outdated economic assumptions used in last year's budget resolution.

The current-level report is a key tool in ensuring effective enforcement of the Budget Act. It compares actual spending and revenues for the fiscal year with the limits set in the budget resolution.

Furthermore, most of the Budget Act's enforcement points of order are tied to the current level report.

In contrast to the House report, the Senate has filed a current level report using CBO's January economic and



technical assumptions. The two reports have significantly different bottom lines.

Under the House Budget Committee's outdated assumptions, total outlays are under the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution ceiling by \$4.5 billion.

Under the report filed by the Senate, actual outlays exceed the spending limit by \$13.4 billion, thus triggering points of order against all future spending bills.

My question to the Budget Committee chairman is this: Why the rosy scenario? When does he intend the current-level report to reflect reality? Will it be new and improved? Or, to quote Democratic rhetoric, will it consist of little white lies?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

□ 1910

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding and taking out this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address three points.

After the November election I read the newspapers and I saw rejoicing in the Democratic Party. They had won control of both Houses of Congress, and they said it with great rejoicing, "We are in charge here." And indeed, they are in charge here. Anybody who does not understand that should take some time to study the way things are done in the House and now in the other body when the Democratic Party is in charge.

They have pledged their leadership to demonstrate that they can govern when they are in charge. Let us see what happened in the budget process.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, what is the ratio in the House, what are the numbers the Democratic Party enjoys here in the House of Representatives?

Mr. ARMEY. I do not know the exact numbers, but the ratio I think that they have is about 64 percent of the House.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I think that is right. I think it is 267 to 167, or something like that.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate that, and we need to understand that.

But we need to trace this budget process. Pursuant to the legislation in the Budget Act and in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Deficit Control Act, the Democratic majority in this body and the other body asked the White House, the administration, to present their budget and present it they did 2 months ago. The President of the

United States and his administration laid their budget on the table.

Now I am told as I read the papers from Los Angeles to Chicago, from Dallas to Washington, I am told that the Democrats say the President is not participating in this process.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the earliest times any budget has ever been presented by a President to the Congress, is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely right. I remember the Director of the Office of Management and Budget making the point of how hard his people had worked, even through the holidays, to meet that deadline as requested by this body.

Mr. BUECHNER. And did we not have before our committee the Secretaries of almost every one of the Cabinet-level positions?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct, we did.

Mr. BUECHNER. And they answered any questions that any Member, Republican or Democrat, posed to them. And I think, if I am not mistaken, if there were any questions that any Member wanted to have followed up on, every response was that we will present the answers to those questions, that they would submit to us later.

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely, the gentleman is absolutely right.

That brings me back to the point. What we read in the paper today is that the problem is, according to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the problem is the President is not involved in the process.

Let me remind my colleagues the President laid his cards on the table 2 months ago. Every member of the Cabinet has been before the Budget Committee to discuss the President's budget proposal. The majority members, the Democrat members on the Budget Committee have had ample time to work on that budget and use it as a point of departure, but they have ignored that.

Now let me tell my colleagues where we are today. Nobody among those in control here in this body, the Democrat majority, or in the other body, have put their budget proposal on the table. Mr. Speaker, I have to say where I come from if you want to get in the game you ante up. The President and his administration has done that. If, indeed, the Democrat majority in this body wants in the game, they have to first acknowledge that our President is in the game, he has anted up, he has put his cards on the line, and it is time now for them to ante up. Let us see what their proposals are.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I just have to include this in our discussion, and this is out of today's Post, a headline article that, "Democrats try new budget strategy." This is a quote from my good friend, TONY COELHO. It says, "Calling the budget and deficit impasse the most important crisis we have, and terming Reagan's budget as scam, COELHO accused the President of refusing," get a load of this, "of refusing to engage," refusing to engage. They have not even had the guts to come out here and give us their proposal. How in the world can one engage with someone who will not put their proposal forward?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is absolutely right, absolutely right.

Let me make this point: The complaint, it appears, is that the President's budget does not meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target. If this is the law of the land, and if we have pledged to meet that, and if we are presented with a proposal that does not meet it, what would one suppose would be our logical responsible response? To try to go further than that proposal.

I just want to make one point. The people of the country have to understand the special budget language used in this body. The fact of the matter is, by the proposal of the chairman of the Budget Committee, he has told us he would like to begin with a freeze at the 1987 levels. We will come to 109.5. That is 1.5 removed from the 108 target of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings without increases, not with cuts, but with no increases in spending.

Mr. MACK. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Is the gentleman really saying that there is the possibility that one could meet the target by freezing, just freezing last year's level, not making any of these cuts that people keep talking about?

Mr. ARMEY. Absolutely.

If I might just ask you to understand, we might not want to take a freeze because we need to make trade-off decisions.

I want to make one point before yielding further. If we can then get the people of this country to understand that in Washington, when we talk about cuts, we are not talking about reducing from any prior level of spending, or any existing level of spending, we are saying when we say cut that we would not be allowed to spend as much as we hoped to spend. I wish I could take that home and look at my family budget and say that is what a cut means.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to maybe challenge the point that was made earlier, although I am in agreement with the point the gentleman was trying to make. I believe it was the gentleman from Florida who made the suggestion that the other side has not been willing to come forth with anything. In fact, while they have not been willing to put their names on a document and say here is our total package, here is how we are going to structure the budget to reach the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings targets, here is how we prove we can govern—they keep saying they can govern, but they have not been willing to do it, but they have certainly come forth with proposals. They have come forth with proposals to raise taxes over and over again. One of our colleagues has referred to the new Speaker of the House as Mr. Tax of the Week, always a new tax idea.

They have proposed that we cut our defense budget so severely that I think it would seriously damage our military credibility and our ability to defend the country. And the other thing they have done, and they have repeatedly done, is to say maybe we ought to move away from the \$108 billion, maybe we ought not to live within Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, maybe we ought to tell the American people we did not really mean it that we were going to balance the budget.

So with all due respect, while they are not willing to put forth a specific document, there is no question they have certainly had proposals.

Mr. ARMEY. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma is absolutely right.

If I can make a point, the need they have spoken of for a tax increase is not a need to maintain current spending levels because they can do that and meet Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. They need to raise your taxes so they can spend more, and Lord have mercy, I hate to guess at what it is they want to spend our tax dollars on this time.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] that I read in the paper that not only do they propose to raise taxes by about \$18 billion, but this whole strategy is designed, according to a Washington Times article of today, the whole strategy is designed to pressure, to pressure House Republican Members to join in with them on that.

Now we are not about to do that, are we?

Mr. ARMEY. I do not intend to join in any proposal that begins with sur-

rendering on the obligation we accepted to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target and schedule, and instead to raise taxes so we can raise spending.

I know I have used more time than the gentleman has so graciously allowed me and I appreciate his patience and would yield back to the gentleman from Ohio and thank him again.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I stand here as a freshman Member who last Thursday, if I could say that at any one time in the 2 months that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body I thought that in that room there were more statesmen than there were politicians.

□ 1920

At that time, it seemed to many of us that we had a golden opportunity to really do something about what is a dark cloud hanging over this country, and that is the deficit, as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] had pointed out; that that dark cloud is still there.

What is worse is that a little ray of sunshine that had popped through was yanked from us before we could even sit down as equal members, not as members of any political party, but as equal members, and to discuss what we will do about this deficit. Instead, we had to hear about it through the press that we are going to start off what is clearly a political position.

It is not a meaningful position; it is not a position that in true budgetary sense can be dealt with, but is a political position.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOULTER. Are you talking about the freeze?

Mr. BUECHNER. I am talking about the freeze.

Mr. BOULTER. Did the gentleman read—I bet he did—in today's Washington Times where it is reported that Mr. GRAY concedes that he could not support a spending freeze?

Mr. BUECHNER. Well I would say that that is just another part of what was a moment, I think, which this Congress would have been able to put on a par with the First Congress.

In the First Congress, they went in a room and they were able to decide things which literally were visionary; that dealt with times that had tried men's souls; and certainly the men and women at that time had risked their lives for freedom.

What we are trying to do in this Congress is free ourselves from the dark cloud of this deficit. That moment was snatched from us by what was obviously a political move. I am sorry that that day came about, and that we are forced to come here to present our case to the American people, Mr. Speaker, so that they understand that the majestic sham that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] so eloquently spoke of, has occurred.

We were denied an opportunity to go down in history as a Congress willing to deal with problems. Instead, we are faced with politics.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. Certainly I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the Congress adopted this policy of having a budget, and we would come up with two budgets during the year; and the second one would be binding, and that is how we are going to bring order to this place.

It was the most important piece of legislation potentially, creating the Budget Committee, that we had undertaken in a long time, because before that the appropriations process had no controls at all.

In order to make that work, this committee, of all the committees in the Congress, this committee is one where there should be a set procedure, with subcommittees and hearings and really taking a hard look at this; and from the very beginning over a period of months, involving the Members from both parties in a true bipartisan effort, but that is not the case.

Mr. BUECHNER. But that is not the case.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. No; not an attempt to say, "Here it is, we've come up with something. You've got 24 hours to tell us what you want to do about it."

I think it is a shame, when the country is in the shape that it is in, economically, when we had the deficit that we have, that politics is being played by the gentlemen across the aisle.

One of the previous speakers referred to the comments by Mr. COELHO, the whip from the other party. To say that when we are trying so desperately to reach a balanced budget, that what we are going to do here is try to play 1988 politics with the American people's budget, I think is really worse than a sham. I think it is a deceit on the American people.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point that a crisis is never the result of a



storm blowing up. It is the result of a whole series of actions over time.

If we look back to 1985, when we debated the 1986 budget, remembering that we are now in 1987 debating the 1988 budget—so I am looking 2 years back to when we were debating the 1986 budget.

During that time, the Democrat majority brought in a budget that would cut \$50 billion. Now, at that time the deficit was manageable. Serious, tough, but manageable. I was not a member of the Committee on the Budget then; I was merely an interested and concerned Member of Congress who got together with a number of others not on the Budget Committee and went through the whole Budget Committee exercise ourselves; and we wrote a budget that cut \$50 billion; we gave it to the Congressional Budget Office; CBO scored it, as we say, and agreed that in fact, that action would have cut \$50 billion.

In contrast, the Democratic majority on the Budget Committee brought in a budget that had not been reviewed by the Congressional Budget Office. It was never scored by the CBO, but they stood here on the floor and said "It will cut \$50 billion."

Within days, ladies and gentlemen, within days I remind you that once CBO took a look at that budget, which only took a couple of days, the \$50 billion had dwindled to \$28 billion. That is \$12 billion seepage.

Now, we are not talking just dollars; we are talking the future of our economy. We are talking the trade deficit; we are talking democracy at work.

Well, at the end of a few days, the \$12 billion had seeped, but at the end of the budget process, when the appropriations bills had been passed, those spending cuts that were adopted in that bill had dwindled to one-tenth of what the budget resolution had committed this House to. The Democratic budget resolution, backed up by the Democratic committee chairmen, had whittled away their own budget resolution so that the reality in that time of crisis was that the budget cuts in reality were one-tenth of what they had been out here in the rhetoric of the 1985 debate on the 1986 budget.

So let us look at 1986, when we were debating the 1987 budget. That budget, that year, came to the floor again—no Congressional Budget Office review—you have to ask yourself how serious are these proposals when they cannot be developed far enough in advance to be run through the Congressional Budget Office so that they can come here with somebody having said that this in fact will work.

Let us look at the outcome of the process in 1986 on the 1987 budget. Well, the record as of January 1987 is that we enacted \$20 billion in cuts, but in January 1987 we were actually \$27

in add-ons. We were spending \$27 billion over what our own budget estimates had called for.

It is a miserable record. It is the cause of today's crisis. It is the reason Gramm-Rudman was passed, the reason we must continue to focus on the objectives that Gramm-Rudman committed us to, and indeed, the chairman, to demonstrate his seriousness, must put a Democrat mark on the table just as last year the Senate Republicans put a tough Republican mark on the table in this Congress and in this budget process, and I stand here as one deeply committed to addressing the deficit who says, "If you are going to lead the Nation, now is the time to demonstrate where you will take it."

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### WOODY HAYES, A GREAT FOOTBALL COACH AND A GREAT AMERICAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning, just as I was leaving my apartment for the office, an announcement came on television that Woody Hayes, the former Ohio State University football coach died this morning at the age of 74.

The announcement continued: "he is best known for slugging a Clemson football player in the 1978 Gator Bowl game."

Those might not be the exact words, but they are fairly close. The form of the announcement distressed me because I had lost a friend, and the Nation had lost a great American.

I was distressed more because the announcer said Woody Hayes was best remembered for a minor episode in the life of this great man which, those of us who knew him personally had long since forgiven and forgotten.

I first met Woody Hayes in 1952. I was immediately impressed by his colorful enthusiasm, which was infectious. My wife, Marjorie, and I came to know Woody and his wife, Anne, on a personal basis over the years, and I had intended to attend a memorial service at the First Community Church in Marble Cliff yesterday to tell Woody's wife, Anne, how much we would miss Woody and to say thanks

to her for being the good friend that she is; but found it necessary, regretfully, to be here.

I was in a gathering of people with Woody during the summer; he loved to talk politics and ask me about my own campaign. He observed that I might have to work a little harder to get reelected this time, and said, "If there is anything I may do to be of assistance to you, I'd like to do it. Just let me know."

He said, "I think you've been an excellent Congressman, and deserve to be reelected." Well, that was high praise to me coming from the best-known and most famous constituent I have.

□ 1930

About a month later I asked Woody if he would be willing to host a riverfront "rally for WYLIE." He accepted immediately. He came to the rally, talked to those assembled in inspiring tones about me and why I should be reelected. He had an incomparable way of putting words together that made them stick in your mind. He stayed for 2 hours, signing autographs, having pictures taken, even though he had suffered a stroke in 1984 and a heart attack less than a year before and needed a cane to assist him in moving around. Later on as the campaign heated up, I asked Woody if he would do a television spot for me. He agreed without hesitation and it was one of the most effective magnificent television ads any candidate for public office could ever have hoped for.

Woody did not do that often. He picked his candidates.

He once endorsed Ben Espy when he was running for city council. Ben was running last in the polls.

So Woody endorsed him on a television ad which he ran for about a week before the election. Much to everyone's surprise, probably even Ben's, he won the election. Ben had played football for Woody and Woody knew him to be a good man. He said, and I add, "Even though a Democrat."

Certainly Woody Hayes was one of the greatest football coaches of all time. But he also taught character and the value of an education.

Rex Kern, his quarterback on the national championship team in 1968 said that 84 percent of the ball players that Woody coached graduated and when Rex went to play for the Baltimore Colts he said that only 2 out of the 15 recruits of that class had graduated from college and he was glad that he had gone to Ohio State.

Archie Griffin, the only two-time Heisman Trophy winner said when Woody came to his house to recruit him that all he talked about was the good education he could receive at Ohio State and never once mentioned football. Archie said he went home

and told his father, "I am not sure he wants me to play football at Ohio State. All he talked about was getting a good education." And his father said, "That is a good place to go, son, he really does want you to play football."

He was also a remarkable historian. Woody wrote a book, "You Win With People." He had a deep sense of loyalty to his friends and a deep sense of compassion for ill persons and those in need.

I would like to quote from an editorial in the Columbus Dispatch of March 13 called, "The Greatest Day of My Life." It came when he addressed the winter commencement at Ohio State University in 1986. There he called on the graduates to "pay forward" returning the help they had received by helping other people. "So seldom can we pay back because those whom we owe, your parents and those people will be gone," he said.

Bob Green in an article in the Columbus Dispatch talks of having a dinner with Woody a couple of years ago at the Jai-Lai Restaurant. He quoted one of his sayings. "You see," Woody said, "the important thing is not always to win, the important thing is always to hope."

Then Woody quoted from a poem, one of his favorite poems that his dad used to quote from: "And in the night of death, hope sees a star, and listening love hears the rustle of a wing."

So although I could not be at the biggest memorial service in the history of the First Community Church, I wanted to use this forum which we as Members of Congress have available to us to say to Anne, his wife, Judge Stephen Hayes, his son, his daughter-in-law, Kathleen, and his two grandchildren, Phillip and Laura, that they were in my thoughts and that Marjorie and I would like to express our deepest sympathy on the great loss of your husband, father, and grandfather and to compliment Anne for the very gracious way in which she accepted the busy life of a husband who had so much dedication for others.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Columbus Dispatch, Mar. 13, 1987]

#### THE DAY WOODY DIED

Why did we love Woody Hayes? He was irascible, brash, domineering and intimidating. He made mistakes and never apologized. He had many qualities that people love to hate. He knew it and sometimes flaunted it.

But if you walked about Columbus yesterday, the day Woody died, you could hear his name everywhere. On the streets and in the offices. In fast-food restaurants and in courtrooms. In gas stations and in City Hall.

Woody was on the minds of the mighty and the meek, the professional and the laborer, the minister and the manager, those who knew him and those who only know of him. He was a hero to most, a man to be admired, a role model for children, a sage for adults.

We loved him because he engendered in each of us the desire for greatness. He

taught that achievement required work, that success required sweat.

He taught us to expect adversity, and to believe in our ability to overcome it. His teachings were for each of us. To confine his legacy to the football field does the man a great injustice.

Though it is sometimes overlooked, he also was an educator, a professor in the College of Education. He also was a history buff. He saw in history lessons that applied not only on the football field but to the day-to-day challenges of life.

His football fame was, of course, of historic proportions. His Ohio State football teams were disciplined, determined squads that reflected the coach's passion for fitness and execution—and for victory. He became so closely identified with the university that his name was synonymous with OSU.

His sense of loyalty to friends and decency to those in need were also well-known. He was loyal to his players, of whom he demanded academic achievement as well as athletic excellence; loyal to his former players, staying in touch, counseling them with problems and personal decisions; and loyal to his staff. Three of his former assistants are now head coaches in the Big Ten.

"He was one of the greatest men I've ever known, and one of the greatest humanitarians," said Jack Nicklaus, a former Ohio State golfer who went on to an incomparable professional career.

But he did not belong just to the famous, nor to the athlete, nor to the history book. He did not stop living when his coaching career ended in 1978.

He looked for other ways to inspire and contribute. He was a frequent dinner speaker and talked to school classes. He visited many ill persons.

What he called "the greatest day of my life" came when he addressed the winter commencement at Ohio State in 1986. There, he called on the graduates to "pay forward," returning the help they had received by helping other people. "So seldom can we pay back because those whom you owe, your parents and those people, will be gone," he said.

We loved Woody Hayes because he challenged us to be the best we could be. We saw his faults, and recognized our own. But we saw his greatness, and recognized our own potential.

We'll remember the day Woody died, because that day a little bit of us died, too.

#### COMMEMORATING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, the world witnessed another great triumph for democracy. Liberty, as in the American and French Revolutions, once again hurled her fury against the forces of oppression and misery.

Pericles, as reported by Thucydides, extolled the fallen Athenians in the Peloponnesian War by declaring, "that prosperity can be only for the free, and that freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it." In their struggle for independence, the founders of modern Greece continued this tradition by fighting for democracy and freedom.

Western civilization owes a great debt to the Greek people. The concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern rests with the people, first came to full fruition in the fertile soil of Hellas.

Our two nations share a special relationship. The Founding Fathers of the United States of America drew heavily upon the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our representative democracy. In their turn, the fathers of modern Greece looked to the American experience in forming their new government.

Today, we share more than a mere historical memory. The Government of Greece is a long-time ally and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Moreover, our country benefits greatly from contributions and talents of Greek-Americans in the areas of education, the arts, law, medicine, science, government service, and private enterprise.

On January 21, 1986, the Senate and House of Representatives in Joint Resolution 308 designated March 25, 1987, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." I offer my sincerest congratulations to the people of Greece and to Greek Americans on this occasion.

#### THE NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to talk about the need for an effective budget which would help us control Government spending and bring the deficit under control, and the actions of the Budget Committee. I am looking forward to having a chance to talk with a number of my colleagues who are on that committee. I would be delighted to allow them to talk. I am going to start with the very distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois, who is a leader in the Republican Conference and who has been a leader on the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to her.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. I hope I would be able to talk with some of my colleagues while I am here. I regret I can no longer by law be on the Budget Committee. So I need from them some information on how the budget is proceeding this year.

Now I recognize that the Republicans do not control the House and so, therefore, you cannot necessarily tell me exactly how everything can move.

Mr. MACK. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. The gentlewoman said something that kind of struck me for a



moment. She said the Republicans do not control the House. Can the gentlewoman give me an idea of how long it has been since Republicans controlled the House?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I was not even a gleam in my parents' eyes, I am told. It was so long ago. Believe me, I am aging rapidly.

Mr. MACK. I think the year was 1954.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Well, then, I was a gleam.

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes, slightly more than a gleam but too young to know better.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. But too young to remember.

Mr. MACK. The point I am making is it was 1954 was the last time that the Republicans controlled the House. Certainly since 1974 when the budget law was put together we have never controlled the budget process in this House.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for reminding me. I do not see any Democrats here so I have to ask you: Can you tell me just briefly the outlines of the Democratic budget that has been presented to your committee to make some of the changes that rightfully they will want to make?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. We have not seen the color of the paper, even, that their budget is written on. The morning paper reported that in fact Chairman GRAY, after caucusing with his Members, was unable to come up with any kind of a budget. So we are going to start with the 1987 budget and go from there.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Will the gentleman just wait, pause because I am taken a bit aback by that. Now the President by law has to turn in a budget. Certainly if he had been late on that, regardless of party, we would have stood up and complained that he was not fulfilling his obligation.

Now the President did turn in a budget.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. The President turned the budget in very early, by historical standards. It has been up here since the first week in January.

Mr. MACK. In fact, he complied with the Gramm-Rudman target for submitting his budget, which I believe was January 5, which is earlier than it had been done in the past.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly not expect you to agree with everything in the President's budget because the Congress has a right to dispose. And it is the Congressional Budget Act.

So now with the President's budget ahead of one, what areas have the Democrats suggested, what param-

eters have they begun to tell the American people about so we can know what, under their leadership, is forthcoming from the Budget Committee?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. As the gentlewoman might remember, the Speaker has made a number of speeches around saying that it is necessary for the American people to pay more in taxes. As you and I both know, when we came to the Congress taxes were some \$599 billion in 1981 and they are now going to be \$842 billion. So we are not short of taxes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. \$300 billion more in revenue and yet—so we have on one hand, we do have a suggestion from the majority to again, on working men and women and on senior citizens, on young people starting out, to impose a burden?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. We not only have a suggestion from the majority but from the leader of the majority, the Speaker, JIM WRIGHT, from Texas.

Mr. MACK. From Taxes?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Taxes, Yes.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I may interrupt I am confused. Is the Speaker the Democratic leader from Taxes, T-a-x-e-s or Texas, T-e-x-a-s?

Mr. DENNY SMITH. I think you could make the point that he is from Taxes.

Mr. GINGRICH. So the Democratic leader is from Taxes and wants more taxes.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. And from Fort Worth, in Taxes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Just to continue with the gentleman from Florida, who is a member of the committee, and as I recall an extraordinarily hard working member of the committee, and I hate to ask it again, but do you mean to tell me that with the months—we are now in mid-March, in fact yesterday was the Day of St. Patrick—there is still no Democratic document so that the American people can know the plan, difficult as it may be to achieve, to see where you can cut spending and to lay out the blueprint under this new leadership for America? There is nothing, there is no blueprint, there is no paper, there is no plan?

□ 1940

Mr. MACK. I think that the best way to answer that is, yes, there is no plan.

Let me give you, though, kind of a framework that seems to have leaked over the last several weeks and months. There is one thing that we do know for sure, that part of that plan is going to be raising taxes. Raising taxes.

We know that. It has been said over and over. As a matter of fact, there was an article in the paper today that implied that maybe the Democrats were using this change in strategy to

try to have a markup session tomorrow with no formal proposal from them, have this markup in open session, and then it was questioned as to whether they were doing that in order to be able to back away from earlier suggestions that they were going to raise taxes.

The reaction was, "oh, no, we are not backing away from raising taxes." So the first framework that I would point out is that they want to raise taxes.

The second thing is clearly that they are moving away from the Gramm-Rudman target. The only plan that they have talked about so far talks about \$36 billion in deficit reduction.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Is this the same Democratic Party that has complained bitterly about the trade deficit when there is at least one constant agreement, regardless if one is a protectionist or free trader, there is agreement that unless we lower the fiscal deficit, that the trade deficit continues? Is this that same party that will not now come up with a budget?

Mr. MACK. I would say that is correct.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. If one were a senior citizen worried about Social Security, worried about the future of this Nation, what kind of answer is this for those people who have given so much to America?

Mr. MACK. I think that the answer is, and it frankly is the one that the Democrats fear to hear, and that is that they lack discipline. They lack discipline to come forward with a plan that shows the American people—although it would be different than the way I do it—the point that they have made over and over and over to us for the last several years is that the President has failed in leadership.

Now, I remind you that the President has come forward with his plan year after year. We sure have not seen theirs.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I think that what the majority whip, TONY COELHO, said, he called the Reagan budget a little white lie. Basically, he is unwilling to put his budget forth, or the Democrat Party's budget forth, but the President's budget is being berated as a little white lie, when they have no budget at all.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. A rather dark gray lie.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. That is right.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I still commend you for not just this special order, but for sitting in a Budget Committee where the frustration level must be high.

I would just say to anyone listening and watching that it will be very diffi-

cult to meet Gramm-Rudman guidelines. But the President did it, and I happen to differ with some of his priorities, but to then use the word "leadership," and to not meet that obligation is the saddest thing of all.

As a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, we, not just Republicans, but American citizens, deserve to see their blueprint for America before we can go build a house.

I would just say that there is still a lot of dredging and draining to do in the majority party.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, again, I remember when the gentleman and I served on the Budget Committee that last several years. I guess we should have gotten a feeling that this was going to happen.

It was so obvious over the last several years that the House Democrats on the Budget Committee decided not to come forward with their own budget plan, if you will recall, until after the Republicans in the other body had taken the lead. The President came forward with his plan, the Senate Democrats came forward with their plan, and only then, at the last moment, would be we finally see a plan for the Democrats.

So I do not guess we really should be too surprised that here we are this year with the President's plan out January 5, and here it is here, March 18, and we have not seen their plan yet.

As I say, the only thing that we do know from them, all of the words that are coming out in the media, are raising taxes and moving away from the targets that were established under Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is extremely important to talk a little bit about the Gramm-Rudman targets, too. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Mack] was a cosponsor of that, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-Mack. You are, unfortunately, at the tail end so you get dropped off as a word, but I think it is important that we, as responsible Members of this body, talk about the Gramm-Rudman target and why we put it in there.

We put it in there to try and get to the balanced budget. We could not get there in one year because no one has the corporate courage here. But one other thing that the Democrats have been saying, besides raise taxes, is that we cannot meet the target. We have not even tried. They have not even put their budget forth, and here we have a situation where they are saying that we are going to have to move those targets.

That surely is not the best way to do it.

I just wonder if the gentleman, as a cosponsor of that measure, would speak up, and maybe the gentleman in the well with the time, could talk a little bit on that point.

I think that is real critical, the American taxpayers.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for raising that point and would just, maybe to set the stage, it is really hard for me to believe that it was only 15 months ago that this House, rather significantly, passed the Gramm-Rudman Emergency Deficit Balanced Budget Act. Only 15 months ago.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. December 1985.

Mr. MACK. December 1985. Fifteen months later and every effort is being made by the majority party, the party that has controlled this House every year, every budget cycle, every appropriations process since 1954, 15 months, and they are already trying to find a way to weasel out from under this \$108 billion target.

Now, again you have to go back to 1985, I think, to get a feel for what was going on. There was a very strong move in the country that said that something had to be done, something had to be done in order to attack the deficit.

What we saw was that when we came back from a recess, there was such a strong grassroots effort that we were able to bring together legislation, and I might add, by being able to attach it to a request that increased the debt ceiling, we were able to force that legislation through the House. For the first time, the Congress of the United States put into law specific numbers about the goal, what we as a body were trying to accomplish.

We stated for the first time a specific amount of money that we were going to borrow, and if I can just add, having come out of the banking business, I have a tendency to look at it in the sense of the Congress establishing for the first time its own credit limit. In other words, we put a credit limit on probably the most expensive credit card in the history of mankind, this little voting card right here. We said that this little card could not go beyond a credit limit of \$108 billion in the fiscal year 1988.

As the gentleman has indicated, already 15 months later, they are trying to figure out a way so that this can go back to the old way of just spending and spending and spending.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly right. What also has occurred, of course, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional the provision that was really going to provide us with the teeth to do what is necessary here, because the lack of courage here in this body, and in the other body, where we are unable to get enough people to vote to do what the average American would do, that is, have to balance his checkbook. We have the problem here of trying to argue out, sometimes in closed session, but most of the time in an open ses-

sion where you are going to politically embarrass one side or the other.

□ 1950

That is what we are really talking about here. We are talking about politics as usual rather than trying to straighten things out for our children.

Mr. MACK. The gentleman is quite right. I hold this card up, and you may not be able to see what this is from where you are standing. This is not your ordinary credit card in the sense of its being American Express or Master Card or Visa. This is the voting card that each Member of Congress has, and I think that is probably close to a credit card, as I say, but it is a credit card drawing on the taxes or the earned wages of the American people. We take those dollars from them in the form of taxes, and also in the form of borrowing.

It is this card here that represents the borrowing, and this year, under Gramm-Rudman, what we said was that we could not borrow any more than \$108 billion.

Let me just carry on to the point the gentleman was raising, and that is that with the sequester or the automatic enforcement mechanism being dropped out by the Supreme Court, the only discipline that is left in the law, frankly, is the target that we have all agreed on. If we move away from that \$108 billion, we are just once again moving away and weakening the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction plan.

This morning in the Republican conference we passed a resolution stating that the Republican conference here in the House reaffirms and will vigorously defend any attempt to move away from that \$108 billion target.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman raised that point. I think it is an excellent point.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield again, I think it is just extremely important that those targets not be changed. The gentleman made a point this morning in our conference that was really telling. This is not the time to move the targets up. This is the time to stand firm on those targets so we can ensure that we reach that balanced budget by 1990.

I think nothing is more important in our service in the Congress. In my service here for the past 6 years, nothing has been more important to the future of this country than balancing the budget. We can always come up with another excuse for not balancing it. We always will.

There are balanced budget requirements in the laws already. As the gentleman pointed out, this is the first time we have ever set a limit on borrowing and trying to get to that balanced budget again, but we ultimately



are going to have to have some kind of a constitutional amendment which will help balance the budget.

I think of all the things the President has talked about, that is going to be one of the really tough ones, because we are not going to get it approved in these last 2 years of the Reagan administration because the Democratic Party, under the leadership of "Tax" WRIGHT, is not going to be able to bring itself to balance the budget or adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. So unfortunately, I do not think we are going to have that as an opportunity. But let me say that the people who are watching out there in your district and my district and other Members' districts need to write to their Congressmen supporting a balanced budget amendment. That is one of the things we really need as a tool.

Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MACK. I absolutely agree, yes. The reason we have to do that again is because the Congress can change the law any way it wants to, to avoid the very hard choices. The change they are seeking now is in the \$108 billion.

The gentleman mentioned that there is already a law that requires a balanced budget, but that is waived every year, so the only way to really get it done is to put it in the Constitution.

Let me build on the point the gentleman made a minute ago. This is not the time to be moving away from the target. If someone is serious about getting a significant reduction in the deficit from fiscal year 1987 to fiscal year 1988, the way that is going to be done is to keep the pressure on by forcing us to get down to that \$108 billion figure. If we would raise it, as some would suggest, to \$135 or \$140 billion, I am convinced that the plan you and I would see, while on the surface it might indicate \$30 or \$35 billion in budget reductions, would mean that the real savings out of that plan probably would be in the neighborhood of \$20 billion, and a \$20 billion reduction in the deficit is not something that is going to help very much.

Mr. DENNY SMITH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield again, it might not even be that much because it is my understanding that within the next couple of weeks we are going to have a supplemental spending bill of \$12 billion. That will come along in the next couple of weeks.

This is just a way of saying that we are going to use our credit card again regardless of what the ceilings were or what we set. So we have to have some help in the Constitution. We just do not have control over this corporate body. It is just an outrage that we do this.

Mr. MACK. Look at the game that is being played. We are being told by the Democrats that they cannot reach the

target of \$108 billion and they have got to move this thing up, and one of the reasons for that is because they say we were not able to get down in the savings as far as we wanted to last year. In other words, we failed last year.

But they also make the claim that there is enough room in the budget resolution that was passed to allow for \$12 billion more to be added to the 1987 spending level. Then they want to come back in and tell us, "Well, gee, we just can't meet the \$108 billion figure."

Mr. DENNY SMITH. The gentleman will remember, too, that it was not too long ago—it was either September 1985 or September 1986—that we rolled the pay of the military into September 30 out of the first day of October so we could move that back into a different fiscal year. There are a lot of outrages like that that occur in the operation to monkey with the numbers. It is not really an honest way to do business.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me ask something. I am curious about this.

I do not serve on the Budget Committee, and I would like to get an answer. How many Republican staffers are there, and how many Democratic staffers are there on the Budget Committee? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. MACK. I could give the gentleman a guess, and it would be pretty close. I believe on our side, the Republican side, we have 13, somewhere around that number, and the number I hear on the Democratic side is somewhere between 70 and 80.

Mr. GINGRICH. So they have something like five or six times as many staff members on the Democratic side than there are on the Republican side?

Mr. MACK. Yes, sure.

Mr. GINGRICH. And the chairman controls that staff. So the Democrats who control the House have now controlled the House for some 32 years. They have been in charge, they pass the budget bill, they control the Budget Committee, and they hire five or six times as many staff members. But the Democrats are in fact going to say to you in the morning that they like the Presidency and they are glad they have the Senate and they are glad they have the House, but gee, even with five times as many staff members, they cannot show us what they would do with the budget? Is that a correct evaluation?

Mr. MACK. I think that is absolutely right on target.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman that if he would have read Sunday's Washington Post, he would have discovered in an article by David Broder, who is one of the most prestigious political writers

in America, some explanation of what you two are being put through. It is one page 1 and it is titled "Democrats Find Taxes Treacherous Territory." The article says, and I quote:

Just when the Democrats thought it was safe to go back into the old political waters, that great white shark—taxes—has opened its jaws again.

As the Democratic-controlled House Budget Committee heads into drafting sessions late this week on the fiscal 1988 budget, party leaders are having an acute attack of nerves. Two of the key figures—House Speaker Jim Wright (D-Tex.) and Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dan Rostenkowski (D-Ill.)—are fussing publicly with each other on the question of raising taxes to cushion spending cuts for defense and domestic programs. And others are running for cover.

In an interview last week, the new speaker—who has proposed so many alternative revenue-raising ideas that Rep. Hank Brown (R-Colo.) has called him the "tax-of-the-month" man—said a bit defensively, "I know it's not a pleasant thing to hear, and I'm trying not to be abrasive. But I think I have a minimal responsibility to tell the truth."

The truth—as Wright and House Budget Committee Chairman William H. Gray III (D-Pa.) see it—is that cutting the deficit significantly enough to satisfy even a broad interpretation of the target mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings statute will be impossible without new revenues and difficult even with them.

Now, it seems to me that what Broder has said is, quite simply, that the Democrats cannot bring themselves to put Government on a diet, and the Democrats are divided over whether or not to come forward publicly and say that Walter Mondale was right, that what they need is more taxes and more money from the American family. So the Democrats now are trying to play a game because they do not have the courage to come forward and say, "Look, given liberal Democratic values and liberal Democratic interest groups, it makes sense for the liberal Democratic House to raise taxes because the family budget is not nearly as important to the average liberal Democrat as the Government budget."

So they would rather have more money for the Government than revenue for the American family. In that context, then, I would say that Mr. Broder has put his finger on what is happening.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, let me just mention another article that appeared in the Washington Post today, also by David Broder, and it is entitled: "A 'Budget Summit' Is Possible."

In one of the paragraphs, it mentions that Reagan has submitted a budget and states that "it is a state-

ment of administration priorities." The article goes on to say this:

Democrats have a comparable obligation to apportion available dollars among defense, entitlements and domestic programs and to make it clear how much money they think the government should raise to pay for them.

In other words, I think what the press is saying is that "we have listened to you talk all these last several years about leadership on the budget issue." I think they are clearly saying, "we also recognize now that as a result of the election in 1986, with your control of the Senate and your continued control of the House since 1954, you at least have an obligation to come forward."

They have an obligation not just to tell those of us in the Congress what their plan is for raising taxes, reducing spending, or putting together a budget resolution that meets the target of \$108 billion, but to at least level with the American people as to what their plan is. But they are scared to death. That is the word I got from several Members who have been talking with the Democrats. They are scared to death to come forward with their plan.

I think one of the things that really has them nervous is that all this rhetoric they have used in the last several years about lack of leadership is coming back to haunt them, and they really want to try to squirm out from under putting a plan on the table.

So I think that what we are doing here tonight is just in a sense kind of like round 1, and anyone who thinks that the budget is going to be determined tomorrow or the day after is sadly mistaken. There are going to be several rounds before it is all over.

□ 2000

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask my friend from Florida, if you were the Democrats would you not be scared to come up and be blunt and say to the American people, Yes; we want to take more money out of your family budget; we want to take more money away from your own opportunities?

Mr. MACK. Again, if they believe that, I would put it in this context: It is not necessarily particularly easy for me or others who vote continuously to try to reduce Federal spending, it is not particularly easy to do that, but I happen to believe that that is the answer. So I am willing to vote on that kind of an issue. I am willing to put those ideas forward.

I would say that those individuals who clearly believe that the answer, and you know it as well as I do, quietly in conversations they will give this kind of "Listen, you and I both know," or "Everybody in their right mind knows that the only way to solve the problem is to raise taxes." All I am saying is if that is what you believe, let us see the plan. Put it forward, let

us debate it. You defend it. We will give you an alternative at that point but we feel we have the right to see your plan. After all, you do run this place, and after all, you have been running it since 1954.

Mr. GINGRICH. So what you and the other Budget Committee members have been reporting tonight to the House is that tomorrow the Democratic Party which has run the House for 32 years, the Democratic Party which controls the Speakership, the Democratic Party which hires six or seven as many staff members, the Democratic Party whose chairman gets the big office and the power of scheduling, that Democratic Party is going to come to the Budget Committee and say, "We have no plan, we have no budget." Here we are 75 days after Ronald Reagan sent his up, we have nothing, and they are going to blame the President for lack of leadership.

Mr. MACK. Again, it is absolutely amazing. Of course, we all know TONY COELHO and we enjoy him but I mean he really has got, I mean just about say anything. Again, I want to quote this out of the Post article. It says, calling the budget and deficit impasse the most important crisis we have and terming Reagan's budget a scam, get a load of this: "COELHO accuses the President of refusing to engage." I mean, engage what? What is the alternative? Where is their plan. What are their ideas? Come on TONY, you can do better than that.

Mr. GINGRICH. So you are saying it is not a choice between a liberal Democratic plan and President Reagan's plan, it is a choice between President Reagan's plan and an absolute vacuum among the liberal Democrats.

Mr. MACK. I think that is exactly right. In fact what we hear is that they are going to come tomorrow and just put last year's budget on the table.

Mr. GINGRICH. Would not the correct motion tomorrow morning then be to move that the Budget Committee instruct the chairman to create a mark, to move the budget, that the Budget Committee tell the chairman, "Sit down with your 60 or 70 staff members and propose a budget."

Mr. MACK. We have been trying to say that for quite some time but maybe that might be one more opportunity to make that statement.

Mr. GINGRICH. It would seem to me that the Democrats ought to have an opportunity to instruct their chairman that they would actually like him to do the job of the chairman. That might be a radical idea.

Mr. MACK. It is just over and over for the last several years. This is now my fifth year on the Budget Committee, and it really astounds me that now that they are in total control of the legislative process that they

cannot come forward with their plan. It baffles me.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make one other point because the gentleman from Florida offered today in the Republican House Conference a resolution to keep the target at \$108 billion in deficit which is the Gramm-Rudman target and there was a fairly overwhelming vote in favor of being firm. It does seem to me that we are trying to send two signals to the Democrats. One is that the country really wants to move toward a balanced budget and that is going to take real decisions, and the other is that when you have had a 60-percent increase in taxes collected since 1980, and we are collecting 60 percent more taxes now than we did in 1980, that that is probably enough. That the answer is not to raise taxes, the answer is to control the Federal Government and to control Government spending. I want to commend the gentleman for having had a tenacity and the drive and the persistence to go the Republican Policy Committee and to go to the House Republican conference, but I also want to report to the House that on the Republican side there was a clear signal that we think the Budget Committee should do its job. The President has done his job whether you like or dislike the President's budget, it is at least an effort in the right direction, and now it is the turn of the House Democratic leadership to do their job.

Mr. MACK. I think the gentleman is quite right. Again, if you want to be able to negotiate to a point, you have to have a point of beginning on both sides. For 3 months now or 2½ months we have seen at least there has been one proposal out there, one kind of blueprint about what the administration would do and we have been waiting, I think patiently. As a matter of fact, I think probably too patiently until tonight to ask the other side to come forward with their plan. I think it is very simple and very reasonable.

Mr. GINGRICH. I must ask one thing because this might lead to another interesting question in tomorrow's budget meeting. If the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, who is a powerful and important liberal Democrat in his own right, if he has had 60 or 70 staff people and they have had 75 days, I wonder in the tradition of the Tower Commission if we could not ask the chairman to make available to all Members of the House, the various staff proposals on the Democratic side.

Let's see what it is that they are so scared of they cannot even surface it. Let them bring out in the open whatever taxes they propose. Let them bring out in the open whatever budget cuts they propose. The President has had the courage to actually sit down



and force one document, the budget proposal of the President of the United States. If the Democrats cannot come up with one document maybe they could submit for the record tomorrow during the budget hearing as an initial step, if they are not willing to assign the chairman to go back and actually write a budget, maybe the committee could ask the chairman to put on the record as a source of ideas—I mean, presumably, we have not had 75 days of the Democratic staff doing nothing—it is possible and I understand this House works in unusual ways, but presumably that is not what they have been doing. In that setting it might be useful if the chairman of the Budget Committee could allow all the Members, since he wants all the Members to help vote on the budget, maybe he could allow all the Members to look at all the proposals the Democratic staff has come up.

We have had, I think seven different taxes proposed so far.

Mr. MACK. I think that is a great idea but they will not even allow the one proposal that they have been working on for the last several days. They do not want that one to come out. What makes the gentleman think that he possibly would allow all these various ideas of how to raise taxes and how to continue spending what makes you think he would allow that to happen?

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not know, but it just seems to me that it is, not only is it a little silly for the House Democratic leadership to be saying to the President 75 days after you sent us your budget we have not done anything but, by the way, it is your fault, it seems to me equally silly for the Democratic Party which has been in control of the House for 32 years to turn to the Republicans and say, "Our 70 staff people could not figure it out and our majority could not figure it out, but, by the way, why do you not join with us and we will not show you any of the documents." The least the Republicans ought to insist on before they engage in the process is that the chairman release all of the background documents, because, after all, his party has five or six times as many staff on the Budget Committee and why should you participate in ignorance when he has—it is sort of like a gambler saying, "Gee, I have 52 cards, I will give you 5, I keep 47 and now we will play."

I think the best test of the chairman's sincerity tomorrow would be to say to him if you are really serious about a bipartisan effort, let us see all your staff documents and we will be delighted to try and work with you once we have read your staff documents and your staff memos and we understand what the options are, but do not give us 5 cards and you keep 47

and then pretend that we are playing a fair game.

Mr. MACK. That is something that we might pursue tomorrow morning.

Let me, if I may, express some closing remarks from my point of view on this issue. I start by reading an article in the New York Times, today's paper, and it says that:

The House Democratic leadership, unable to assemble its own plan for cutting the budget deficit, shifted strategy today, partly in an effort to blame Republicans and the President for their problems.

The new strategy is also aimed at educating the public on what many see as the need for a tax increase to reduce the deficit.

□ 2010

I guess the point I want to close with is that clearly the Democrats have now gotten to a point where the rhetoric of the last several years has caught up with them. They have had all this time to come forward with their plan, their proposal, their ideas, and they have failed to do so. That indicates to me two things: One is the lack of leadership, and two is the lack of discipline.

They claimed to the American people in 1986 in the elections that they had the ability to lead. They were disciplined enough to make the tough decisions in order to put a program together, to put a budget together in order to continue to reduce the deficits, to meet the targets of Gramm-Rudman and to solve these problems, and they have clearly failed to do either on the leadership end or from the point of view of discipline within their own party to accomplish the things they had said in the 1986 elections.

So I think it is going to be interesting tomorrow when we have an opportunity to see just how this thing is going to play out.

Mr. GINGRICH. I just want to say one thing in closing while the gentleman is here, and that is anyone who wants to check the record can go back and in the last month and a half before we adjourned in 1986 we were here on this floor saying again and again and again that the first time the Democrats had control of the Senate and the first time the Democrats have a chance to put up their agenda, they are going to try to raise taxes. Some Democrats came down and said, "Oh, we wouldn't do that," but I think it very, very revealing that as soon as there was a new Democratic Speaker, the very first thing that Democratic Speaker began saying was, "Let's tax this, let's tax pensions, and why don't we go ahead and tax pensions?"

Then he came up with other tax proposals. I think it is very revealing that the Democratic leadership neither has the courage to come to the House and say we are going to be for a tax increase, we are all united, here is our budget, nor do they have the courage

to come to the House and say we are not going to be for a tax increase, we are going to cut spending. Here is our budget. Instead, what they are doing is playing a game.

If my good friend, TONY COELHO, was to call the President's activities a scam, I would just say the Democratic leadership has been a sham, that this entire process is a sad travesty of what should be happening and it is very unfortunate.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am very glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Well, I just wanted to make one other comment, that this whole mentioning about taxes and this kind of nervous attitude and reaction, you kind of sense these guys are in a real frenzy. It almost seems like it is an addict that is looking for a fix. "Give me one more new tax proposal. I just have to have it. We have to have the new revenues to keep this thing going." When we know the answer is, go cold turkey.

Mr. GINGRICH. It does make you wonder, I would say, when they talk about going to the budget summit, how many secret tax plans the Budget Committee staff has and how many secret tax plans the Democratic leadership has. It would be fascinating if they had the courage to be as open with us as they would like the White House to be, it would be fascinating to see how many tax plans are already floating around the Democratic offices in this building.

I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOULTER], who is a Congressman from Texas, not a Congressman from taxes.

Mr. BOULTER. Well, that may be a comment on some of my colleagues from Texas, too. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I cannot resist saying this, and I know this is somewhat controversial even among our own Members, but we did in sort of a not too courageous a fashion vote ourselves a congressional pay raise.

Now, what I think makes the situation more sickening is the fact that there are a lot of outrageous Members in this body, and I am not talking about those who felt like the pay raise was in order, but who asked the working men and women in America to take a tax increase to pay for that along with a lot of other programs.

I want to ask my friend from Georgia something. I do not know if the gentleman has discussed these newspaper articles today.

Mr. GINGRICH. Not all of them, but we would be glad to have the gentleman help us with them.

Mr. BOULTER. Well, it is reported in today's Washington Times that the

reason we are going through this charade right now is,

The Democratic strategy is designed to pressure House Republican Members to support taxes.

Talking about a tax increase. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. GINGRICH. My understanding is that the liberal Democrats are caught because on the one hand they desperately want to raise taxes. On the other hand they are afraid to go to the American people by themselves and propose it, so they are hoping to maneuver us into in essence giving them cover so they can get the money without taking the blame.

Mr. BOULTER. Now, the proposal that we are hearing is that we will start with a freeze, is that correct?

Mr. GINGRICH. What I have heard, and of course, I am not on the Budget Committee, so I only rely on my good friends, but what I have heard is that tomorrow morning the Democratic chairman of the Budget Committee is essentially going to come in with last year's budget and say, "None of the work that was done by the President counts, none of the ideas that my 70 staff people have been doing for the last 3 months counts. We have no ideas. Why don't we have an open brainstorming session?"

This is like the PTA in a small town. "Why don't we have an open brainstorming session and see who has a good idea?"

I suggested just before the gentleman came to my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK] that maybe the Republicans should say, "Mr. Chairman, if you really want bipartisanship, would you please open up all your file cabinets and let us have copies of all the staff proposals for the last 75 days so we can also know what the options are?"

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOULTER. The worst part of the idea is that according to again the Washington Times and the headline is, "Gray Proposes Outlay Freeze."

"Gray Proposes Outlay Freeze," but then in the article itself it says that,

Mr. Gray concedes he does not support a spending freeze.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what does he mean?

Mr. BOULTER. That is what I am asking both gentleman.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Does that mean, again, with these 70 staffers in 2½ months and the President's proposal, he has absolutely no idea what he wants to do, he is just going to take last year's budget, but he does not support that?

Mr. GINGRICH. Is it possible that the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Budget Committee does not know the difference between an outlay freeze, the words outlay freeze and spending freeze, he does not know they refer to the same thing?

Mr. BOULTER. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. MACK. Listen, I think clearly the chairman does know, he definitely does.

Mr. GINGRICH. Is this part of the same smoke cloud that is sort of designed to confuse everything?

Mr. BOULTER. I think this is gobbledegook. I will sum up the way I feel about it, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BOULTER. They talk about a tax increase, the Democrats do, and say they are going to use it to reduce the deficit. But let us not forget, and I call your attention to this, that we passed the homeless appropriation bill, which was not included in the budget spending plan, that totals over \$750 million.

Did the gentleman know that also there is a supplemental appropriations Democrat bill just waiting in the wings?

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a second?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. When the gentleman mentioned the \$725 or \$750 million for the homeless, that was authorized for the homeless bill, I think I remember that there was an amendment offered that said that any of the money that had not been appropriated, any additional funds that were going to be appropriated had to be taken out of the foreign assistance account. Does anybody remember that?

Mr. BOULTER. Oh, yes.

Mr. MACK. If I am not mistaken, the majority of the Democrats voted against that, which in essence said, "We're not concerned about keeping the deficit at least to the level that it is now. We are so committed to this new program"—notice the word new—this new program, that they are actually going to increase the size of the deficit. They were not even willing to take it out of the foreign assistance account to keep us in a neutral position.

Mr. BOULTER. Plus also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] is talking about \$1 billion on AIDS research and is not agreeing to cover that by a reduction in something else; so I think it is obvious that they are not serious about reducing the deficit, but they are serious about getting us to participate with them in their nefarious deeds which the American people reject, and that is a tax increase, and they accuse the President of raising taxes. The President has not raised any taxes in the sense of broad

stream taxes that can be used to fund any spending programs that the Democrats come up with. He has talked about user fees to pay for specific services.

□ 2020

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say in closing that I think that what we are faced with here is that tomorrow we are going to see the spectacle—and I think people who are watching ought to think about this: If you are under 32, you were born after the Democrats took over the House.

I am serious. When did the gentleman's grandfather last coach the Athletics?

Mr. MACK. 1951. I think that maybe he technically was not the manager, then, but I assure you that when he was around—

Mr. GINGRICH. So literally the Democrats' control goes almost back to the era when your grandfather was still coaching and was running the Athletics in Philadelphia.

Mr. MACK. That is right.

Mr. GINGRICH. So it tells you a little bit about how much the world has changed. For 32 years the Democratic Party has controlled the House. For 32 years they have had the speakership, they have had the committees, they have passed the budget bill. We now have the spectacle, 75 days after Ronald Reagan sent up his budget, of a party which owns the staff structure, which has six or seven times as many staffers as the Republicans, coming tomorrow to play a game, to say, "We're not going to show you any of our studies, we're not going to show you any of our options, we're not going to let you see any of our proposals, but you have to help us."

I would just say that it is a little bit much to be told that our basic job in the House is to hang around and wait for them to decide that we can provide the camouflage for their tax increase; that if they want us in on the landing, as Lyndon Johnson used to say—another Texan—we ought to be in on the takeoff; that if the Democrats want to share with us a real opportunity to have equal staff, to have equal control, to have equal access to the schedule, to have equal studies, then it makes sense.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I know that we have all been kind of acting as if we are about ready to wind this up, but I just could not help but make an additional comment. Does the gentleman know what I think that maybe they are scared of?

Mr. GINGRICH. What does the gentleman think that they are scared of?

Mr. MACK. Obviously they are scared. I mean, when they invite us, as



they did a couple of days ago, to become involved in a bipartisan effort and then did not follow through with it, they are scared that if they come out with their proposal that it is possible that we might ask for a delay in the markup process while we go around the country holding hearings on their budget.

They do not want the American people to find out that they are really talking about raising taxes. I think that that is what they are afraid of. The longer they can hide what they intend to do, they think that they are better off, and I think what we need to do is to smoke them out.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me make another comment, because as I have listened this evening and tried to understand the almost absurd maneuverings of the liberal Democrats in this situation, it finally began to dawn on me what this is like. When I was here as a freshman in 1979 and 1980—when the gentleman were both very young men out earning a living—when I was here as a freshman the Democrats had the House and the Democrats had the Senate, and they could not blame things on the Republicans. In the summer of 1979 they collapsed into chaos, and they could not solve anything.

The country began to look up here and see that they had 13-percent inflation, they had 22-percent interest rates, they were raising taxes, they were creating a liberal welfare state that we could not afford, and it was just a mess, because once they were responsible and you could see just how liberal they are and just how much they love big government and just how much they favor the welfare state, and just how weak they are on defense, it was pretty appalling.

What we are seeing now is that we have had 6 years where the Democrats could act irresponsibly because they always knew that they were going to go to conference with the Republican Senate, and they knew that there was a President downtown who would sort of protect them from themselves. It is a little bit like the teenager who thinks that he can go out and get drunk because dad will be there and make sure that he does not drive the car home.

Now all of a sudden they have the House and the Senate, and they are faced with the fact that if we actually make them do their job, since they claim to run this place, that they would—I might mention by the way that the distinguished Democratic leader from Texas is going to take a delegation to the Soviet Union in the near future. There are going to be three times as many Democrats as there are Republicans.

Mr. MACK. That makes me very scared.

Mr. GINGRICH. When you get to perquisites, when you get to the chauffeured limousine, when you get to the big office with the window, when you get to everything that makes them feel good about themselves, they are in charge. When you get to the tough decisions—how are we going to shrink the liberal welfare state? How are we going to get spending under control? How are we going to protect the American family from tax increases? They get very scared.

I hope that tomorrow the Republicans on the Budget Committee will give the liberal Democrats a chance to do one of two things—to either come forth with their plan and show us where they will raise taxes, or if they honestly and truly are incapable of governing, to open up a partnership where we have equal access to the information and equal staff, and then we can talk about producing a bipartisan budget.

I thank my friends on the Budget Committee for coming in and enlightening the House on the amazing spectacle in the Budget Committee.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DANIEL (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CARPER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LATTI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MOLINARI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO, for 60 minutes, March 25.

Mr. DeWINE, for 60 minutes, March 25.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today and March 19.

Mr. WYLIE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. OAKAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 30 minutes, on March 19 and 60 minutes, on March 25.

Mr. MacKAY, for 60 minutes, on March 25.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DAUB, preceding the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 77, in the House today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MORELLA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LOTT.

Mr. LOWERY of California.

Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. CRANE in five instances.

Mr. DiOGUARDI.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. GALLO in three instances.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. PURSELL in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. BOEHLERT.

Mr. FIELDS in three instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. WHITTAKER.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. COMBEST.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CONYERS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. LEHMAN of California.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. ANTHONY in two instances.

Mr. GUARINI in two instances.

Mr. ECKART.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. GRANT.

Mr. St GERMAIN.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. WALGREN.

Mr. DINGELL.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 19, 1987, at 11 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

922. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Department's review of energy-related national security concerns covering all aspects of U.S. energy supply and demand; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

923. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting reports of the listing of all outstanding letters of offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1,000,000 or more as of Director 31, 1986, and the listing of those that were accepted, pursuant to AECA section 36(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

924. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notification of a new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

925. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the agency's annual report for fiscal year 1986 on equal employment opportunity and recruitment in the Foreign Service, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3905(d); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

926. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Study of Health Insurance Designed to Supplement Medicare and Other Limited Benefit Health Insurance Sold to Medicare Beneficiaries", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ss(f)(1)(c); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN):

H.R. 1674. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 respecting safety certification equality; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1675. A bill to amend section 123 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to private and voluntary organizations and cooperatives, in order to enhance the private-public partnership for foreign assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 1676. A bill to amend title IX of the act commonly called the Civil Rights Act of 1968, to prevent violence and intimidation directed against persons participating in tenant organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY:

H.R. 1677. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to motor fuel, motor fuel blending stock,

and naphthas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. McHUGH, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 1678. A bill relating to the prevention of circumvention of countervailing and antidumping duty orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHENEY:

H.R. 1679. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to control certain sources of sulfur dioxide to reduce acid deposition; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. COLLINS:

H.R. 1680. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish energy conservation standards for public housing projects and to carry out a program to demonstrate the effectiveness of energy conservation measures in public housing projects; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DEWINE:

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the 3-year basis recovery rule applicable to employees' annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend the Tax Reform Act of 1986 to provide that the repeal of the 3-year basis recovery rule applicable to employees' annuities apply only to individuals whose annuity starting date is more than 90 days after the enactment of this act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIUGUARDI:

H.R. 1683. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for additional immigration visa numbers of natives of certain foreign states which have had a significant decrease in immigration to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 1684. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that any deferral of budget authority proposed by the President shall take effect unless within 45 legislative days Congress completes action on an impoundment bill disapproving such proposed deferral, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that any rescission of budget authority proposed by the President take effect unless specifically disapproved by the adoption of a joint resolution; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on bicycle tires and tubes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKART:

H.R. 1687. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to ensure that the countervailing duty laws apply to State-controlled-economy countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FIELDS:

H.R. 1688. A bill to amend the Panama Canal Act of 1979 to increase the investment of the United States by the amount of interest deposited in the Panama Canal Commission Fund and to transfer that amount to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 1689. A bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code regarding arbitral awards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 1690. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide free insurance up to the value of \$100 on mail items; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income that portion of a governmental pension which does not exceed the maximum benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act which could have been excluded from income for the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. OLIN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. CARR, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. WEBER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SUNIA):

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion from gross income for educational assistance furnished under certain educational assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require increased funding for basic education in developing



countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restrict the purchase of foreign-made administrative motor vehicles by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. FISH, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1695. A bill to require a refund value for certain beverage containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HENRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. FAUNTROY):

H.R. 1696. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to improve the AFDC program by requiring each State to establish a single comprehensive work program with a centralized intake and registration process, and providing for the participation of each AFDC applicant or recipient—through such comprehensive program—in an employment, training, or education program which has been selected by the State on the basis of its appropriateness for that particular applicant or recipient; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN:

H.R. 1697. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to assist States in responding to the threat to human health posed by exposure to radon; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McKINNEY (by request):

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend and extend certain Federal laws relating to housing, community and neighborhood development, and related programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PACKARD:

H.R. 1699. A bill to provide for the settlement of water rights claims of the La Jolla, Rincon, San Pasqual, Pauma, and Pala Bands of Mission Indians in San Diego County, CA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 1700. A bill to establish a quality assurance system for homecare services provided under Medicare and Medicaid Programs, the Social Services Block Grant Program, and the Older Americans Act of 1965; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1701. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit certain airline scheduling practices that result in pas-

senger delays and inconveniences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 1702. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow certain institutions that provide treatment for heart and lung conditions to receive reimbursement under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to improve compliance with Selective Service registration requirements; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

H.R. 1704. A bill for the relief of the assignees and descendants of Marcus P. Norton or their heirs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1705. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 which limit the deductibility of contributions to individual retirement accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER:

H.R. 1706. A bill to repeal the provision relating to the treatment of certain technical personnel which was added by section 1706 of the Tax Reform Act of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT):

H.R. 1707. A bill to establish the Veterans' Administration as an executive department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BIAGI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ROSE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HYDE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WISE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. DOWNEY of New York):

H.R. 1708. A bill to promote the dissemination of biomedical information through modern methods of science and technology and to prevent the duplication of experiments on live animals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CARR, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan):

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax exempt treatment of self-insured workers' compensation funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALGREN:

H.R. 1710. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a grant program to fund research, training, and patient services in pediatric pulmonary medicine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. COLLINS,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McKINNEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STARK, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WYDEN);

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prevent, as a condition of receiving Medicaid benefits for a spouse in an institution, the impoverishment of the spouse still living in the community; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTAKER:

H.R. 1712. A bill to require the establishment of certain grade crossing demonstration projects to improve the safety of rail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTAKER (for himself, Mr. LENT, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 1713. A bill to improve the safety of rail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. MANTON):

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating May 3, 1987 and May 1, 1988 as "Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEWINE:

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution to designate September 1987 as "Partnerships in Education Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. CONTE):

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children should receive increasing amounts of appropriations in fiscal year 1988 and succeeding fiscal years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mrs.

KENNELLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. NEAL:

H.J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing September 21, 1987, and ending on September 27, 1987, as "National Historically Black Colleges Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRANK:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution to request that the President issue a proclamation designating July 4 of each year as the principal national permanent legal holiday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution designating May 3 as "Polish Constitution Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DANEMEYER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. DEWINE):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution calling upon the President to express to the Soviet Union the strong moral opposition of the United States to the forced labor policies of the Soviet Union by every means possible, including refusing to permit the importation into the United States of any products made in whole or in part by such labor; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H. Res. 125. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the definition of the term "nonresident" used by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H. Res. 126. Resolution to repeal rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the establishment of statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EARLY:

H.R. 1714. A bill for the relief of Kil Joon Yu Callahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Reynaldo B. Nido and Bella Anderson Nido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 12: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 31: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 39: Mr. MFUME, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 65: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FLORIO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HERTLE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ROE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 192: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROE, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 274: Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 275: Mr. BRENNAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH.

H.R. 347: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. WISE, and Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 372: Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. COATS.

H.R. 378: Mr. WOLPE and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 381: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 382: Mr. TORRES, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 384: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 385: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FLIPPO, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 386: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 387: Mr. EVANS and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 388: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MYERS of

Indiana, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LATTI, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 437: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 457: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 459: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 470: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 486: Mr. FRANK and Mr. INHOPE.

H.R. 514: Mr. WALGREN and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 541: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 543: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.R. 575: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 579: Mr. SUNIA, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HORTON, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 602: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 618: Mr. COYNE, Mr. WISE, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 627: Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 637: Mr. FAZIO and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 671: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 678: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 679: Mr. YATRON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.R. 680: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 776: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 788: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 789: Mr. KASICH.

H.R. 792: Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. DOWNEY of New York.

H.R. 805: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 810: Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.R. 919: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 941: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 953: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 954: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 957: Mr. SWIFT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FLORIO, and Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 958: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 985: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1003: Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. TOWNS.



H.R. 1013: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. UDALL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1020: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1036: Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1054: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1068: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1076: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1101: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1119: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1161: Mr. APPELEGATE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABO, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 1166: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 1234: Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 1272: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan and Miss SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1302: Mr. STRATTON, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1310: Mr. PENNY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 1342: Mr. FROST, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1372: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 1425: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1468: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. ROE, Mr. WISE, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1524: Mr. LUJAN and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 1546: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1559: Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 1572: Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1622: Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. PORTER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. INHOPE, and Mrs. SAIKI.

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JONES of North

Carolina, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FISH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. COELHO, and Mr. LELAND.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. FROST, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 112: Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. FROST, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 134: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARR, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. FISH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. REGULA, Mr. YATRON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. WEISS.

H.J. Res. 150: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. NEAL.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 160: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SUNDKUIST, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KEMP, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DAUB, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BATES, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. APPELEGATE.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NICHOLS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 189: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RITTER, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. SMITH, of Nebraska, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. MCCOLLUM,

Mrs. Boggs, Mr. Davis, of Illinois, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. CLINGER.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WISE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. FISH, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Res. 23: Mr. FIELDS.

# DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1516: Mr. DELAY.